

AT R E V I E W
OF TEN PVBLIKE
DISPV TATIONS

Or Conferences held vvithin the com-
passe of foure yeares, vnder K. Edward
& Qu. Mary, concerning some princi-
pall points in Religion, especially of
the Sacrament & sacrifice of the Altar.

By I. H. VV H E R B Y,
May appeare vpon how vweake groundes both Catholike Religion
vvas changed in England; as also the fore-recounted Foxian
Martyrs did build their new opinions, and offer themselves to
the fire for the same, vvhibv vvas chiefly vpon the credit of the
said Disputations.

BY N. D.

Aug. lib. 2. against Pesian the Donatist.

VVe are constraigned to heare, discusse, and refuse
these trifles of yours: least the simpler and weaker
sort should fall into your snares.



Imprinted vvith licence

Anno M. DC. IIIII.

The contentes of this Reuievv.

THe Preface shewing what vility disputation may bring, for discusion of matters in controuersy; and how farre: together with the causes, why the reuiew of these ten disputations is now published.

1. Of ten publike disputations, recounted by Iohn Foxe to haue byn held in England, about controuersies in Religion, especially concerninge the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, vvithin the space of foure yeares, at two seuerall changes of Religion vnder K. Edward and Q. Mary; besides many other more particular, held in Bishops consistories and other places about the same matters.

CHAP. I.

2. The state of the cheife question handled in the for- said disputations, concerninge the Reall presence, Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Masse; with the cheefe grounds that be on eyther side.

CHAP. II.

3. Certayne obseruations to be noted, for better answer- inge of hereticall cauillations against the forsaide ar- ticles.

CHAP. III.

4. The examination of such arguments, as in the former disputations were alleaged by the Zwinglians and Cal- uinists, against the Reall presence of Christs body in the Sacrament.

CHAP. IV.

5. VVhat Catholike arguments were alleaged in these disputations for the reall presence: & how they were answered or shifted of by the Protestants.

CHAP. V.

6. Of two other articles about Transubstantiation, and the Sacrament of the Altar, what passed in this dispu- tation.

CHAP. VI.

B-1760.16*



T H E

THE PREFACE,

Shewinge what vtility disputation may
bringe, for discussion of matters in
controuerſie, & how farre: together
vvith the cauſes, vvhy the reuievv
of theſe ten diſputations is now pu-
bliſhed.



HAT diſputation is a good
meanes and profitable in-
ſtrument, to examine and
try out truth, euen in matters of
faith, yf yt be rightly vſed, & vvith
due circumſtances, no man can
deny; for that experience in Gods
Church doth teach yt, to vvitt, that
great vtility hath often-tymes byn
receaued by ſuch diſputations: and
we read amonge other examples,
that in the tyme of *Antoninus* the
Emperour ſonne of *Seuerus*, that
died in *Torke*, a little more then a
hundred yeares after Chriſt, the

Montanists heresy, vvho vvere called also *Cataphrigians*, grovving strong, and dravvinge to it diuers pricipall men, and namely *Tertullian*, vvith the admiratiō of the vvhole vvorld; one *Caius* a Cath. man most excellently learned, and of rare and vertuous life, tooke vpon him to dispute publikely in *Rome* in the presence of the vvhole Church, vvith licēce of *Zepherinus* the Pope, against a chiefe principall man of that sect called *Proclus*, and so confounded him therin, as frō that day forvvard the sect began greatly to decline; of vvhich disputatiō do make mentio

Euseb. l.
6. hist. c.
14. Hier.
de vir.
Illustr. in
Cato.

both *Eusebius* & *S. Hierome*, & yt did much profit that Catholike cause.

2. And about 2. hundred yeares after this againe, vve read of another profitable disputation held in our countrey, by *S. Germanus* & his fellowes, French Bishoppes, vvith the

Brittish

Brittish Pelagians vpon the yeare of
 Christ 429. vtherby they vvere so
 confuted, as also vvith the miracles
 vvrought by *S. German*, hy certaine
 reliques brought from *Rome*, as their
 heresie neuer prospered there after-
 vvard, but vvas soone extinguished.
 VVe read in like manner of diuers
 publike cōflicts & disputatiōs, held
 by *S. Austen* vvith diuers learned he-
 retiks of sundry sects, as namely
 vvith *Fortunatus* a *Manichean* priest,
 in the citty of *Hippo* in *Africa*, vpon
 the yeare 392. al the clergy & people
 being present, & publike notaryes
 appointed to set dovvne both their
 argumēts: & the issue of this dispu-
 tatiōs vvas, that vvhe the *Manichean*
 heretike could not ansvvere, he said
 (saith *Possidonius*) *se cum suis maioribus*
collaturum, that he vvould conferre
 those difficultyes vvith his betters,
 & then if they could not satisfy him

Bed. hist.
 b. 1. c. 24.
 & Consta.
 presbyt.
 in vita
 S. Lupi
 episc.

See the
acts of
this di-
spuratiō
in Possid.
l. de vita
Aug. c. 3.

Aug. epist.
244.

se animæ suæ consulturum, that he
would haue care of his ovvne
soule. But this care vvas (saith the
same *Possidonius*) that he ranne a-
vvay from the citty, and neuer ap-
peared there againe. VVhich point
S. Augustine himselfe obieð, in a
certayne epistle, to another *Mani-
chee* Priest, that came to succeed in
Fortunatus his place in that citty,
prouokinge him also to like dispu-
tation, but the heretike refused the
combatt.

3. And after this againe, the said
Father being novv made Bishopp,
vpon the yeare of Christ 405. he di-
sputed publikely for tvvo dayes to-
geather, vvith another principall
Manichean heretike named *Fælix*,
in presence of the vvhole people,
notaryes being appointed on both
sides to take their arguments. In
vvhich disputation, *S. Austen* did so

S. Austen
disputa-
tion vvith
*Felix Ma-
nicheus*

cui-

evidently conuince his aduersarie, as he in the end yelded (a strange example in an heretike) and renounced his heresie, and became a Catholike, vvhereby the *Maui- chean* heresie vvas so shaken and discredited throughout all *Africa*, as no man euer openly aftervvard durst defend the same in disputation, but it vanished avvay by little and little, as a smoke vvhen the fire is putt out. This vvhole disputation is to be seene at large in *S. Austen*, laid forth in tvvo books of his *de actis cum Felice Manichæo*. And this for the *Manicheans*.

4. But vvith the Donatists and Arrians, he had many other like conflicts: as for example, vvpon the yeare of Christ 411. there vvas a sollemne disputation held at *Carthage* in *Africa*, for diuers daies togeather, betvvene the Catholike and Do-

S. Austen
his dispu-
tation
with the
Donas-
tists.

Breui.
collat.
primi
diei.

Aug. in
Brenic.

natist Bishoppes, the Cath. Bishoppes being in number 286. vvhherof the principall disputer vvas S. *Austen* himselfe; & of the Donatist Bishops 279. vvhich sheweth the multitude of heretiks in those parts to haue byn great, notwithstandinge they had bin much diminished by Cath. Bishops labours and vvrytings: for that 17. yeares before, there mett together against the Catholiks 400. Donatist Bishoppes, exceptinge six: this disputation vvas before the *Conte Marcellinus* gouernour of that countrey, and publike notaryes vvhere present to take the argumēts on both sides, and all being ended the Iudge pronounced this sentence: *Omnium documentorum manifestatione, à Catholicis Donatistas confutatos.* That the Donatists vvhere conuincēd by the Catholiks, by the manifest truth of all kind of arguments.

ments. S. Augustine himselfe setteth forth a breefe relation of all that meeting & disputation, intituling yt *Breuiulum*. And in a certayne epistle of his testifieth moreover of the euent, that albeit those miserable Bishops vv ere not conuerted therby, but rather made more obstinate & obdurate: yet that many of their people vv ere, & especially of the furious *Circumcellians*, that vv ere ready to murder men vpon zeale of their heresie.

Epist. ad Gaudent.

I lett passe another disputation vv hich the said Father had, some 10. or 11. yeares after that, by the order of Pope Zozimus of Rome, in the Citty of *Cesarea* in *Mauritania*, vv ith one *Emeritus* a Donatist B. of that Citty; all the vv hole people of the Citty, togeather vv ith diuers Bishoppes, being present; but little good could be done vv ith him, his obsti-

*Acta apud
Aug. ep.
157. & l.
2. Retract.
c. 51. &
Posidon.
in vita
Aug. c. 14.*

obstinacy vvas so great and peruerse. The acts of that disputation are extant in *S. Austen*, & often mention therof is made by himselfe, & by *Posidonius* in his life. And this for the Donatists.

*Posid. ib.
cap. 17.*

6. But vvith the Arrians I find the same Father to haue had sundry disputations also, as namely once vpon the yeare of Christ 422. the Gouvernour *Bonifacius*, hauinge many Gothes in his campe vvho vv ere of the Arrian sect: they had also an Arrian Bishopp that gouerned them, named *Maximinus*, vvho in their opinion vvas very learned, and therfore they made instance, that he might dispute vvith *S. Augustine*, vv hich the good Father accepted, for he refused none, and so they had their meetinge and disputation, and the acts thereof are extant in his vvorks, togeather vvith

*S. Augustines dis
putation
vvith the
Arrians.*

a cer-

a certaine booke of his ovvne ad-
ded therunto, for explication of di-
uers points, vvherof these heretiks
vvwere vvont to vaunt aftervvard, as
though they had gott the victory;
vvhich happened to the same Fa-
ther in another combatt, held the
very same yeare, vvith one *Conte*
Pascentius of the same Arrian sect,
vvho vvvas cheefe fischoall or trea-
sourer of the Emperour, and most
arrogantlie chalenged to dispute
vvith *S. Austen*, but yet in priuate
& vvithout notaryes, in respect of
the Emperiall lawes, that did for-
bidd publike disputations in fa-
uour of sects and heresies. VVhich
disputation *S. Augustine* accepted;
and the same vvvas held priuatly, in
the presence of many noble and
learned men, but the heretikes
vvould not yeld, but rather publi-
shed soone after (as their fashion is)
that

Aug. epist.
73. 74. 75.
76. 77.

that they had the victory, vvhich *S. Austen* vvas forced to refute by many feuerall epistles, and by settinge forth the disputation it selfe, as yt is to be seene in his vvorks.

7. And this may suffice for a tast of some disputations, held at diuers tymes and in diuers countreyes, vvith heretiks of sundry sects in the ancient Church: And I might recite many more, as that of *Maximus* a learned Catholike monke in *Africa*, vvho vpon the yeare of Christ 645. held a very famous disputation against one *Pyrrhus*, Archbishop of *Constantinople*, a great pillar of those heretiks called *Monothelits*, that held one only vvill, and not tvvo to be in Christ our Sauour, vvhich disputation being made in the presence of many Bilhopps, and of the gouernour of that Country, named *Gregorius Patricius*, the hereticall

Arch-

*Photius in
Bibliotheca.*

*Anastasi-
us hoc
anno.*

Archbishopp vvas so confounded,
as he left his heresie, vvent to
Rome, and gaue vp a booke of his
pennance to *Pope Theodorus*, and
vvas receaued by him into the Ca-
tholike communion againe: and
that vvas the euent of that dispu-
tation.

8. And not full 20. yeares after
this againe, to vvitt vpon the yeare
664. vvas that great disputation
also in England, betvvene the Eng-
lish and Scottish Bishops, about the
observation of *Easter*, in the pre-
sence of tvvo Kings *Oswyn* and *Eg-*
frid his sonne, *Kinges of Northum-*
berland and of the *Mercians*: the
cheefe disputers, on the Scottish
Bishoppes parte, vv ere *Colman* and
Cedda, and of the English, *Agilber-*
tus Bishopp of the *West Saxons* and
Wilfrid: and the issue of this di-
sputation vvas, that Kings *Oswyn*
vvas

*Beda l. 3.
b. 8. cap. 1
25.*

was conuerted to the vnion of the
Roman Church, and caused the
vse thereof to be practized in his
countrey.

9. And so vve see by these ex-
amples, and many more that might
be alleaged, that disputations in
points of Religion are sometymes
necessary, & do much good, vwhen
they are taken in hand vwith equall
and due conditions, and conue-
nient lawes for indifferency in try-
inge out the truth, for that other-
vvayes they may be pernicious, &
haue byn refused by anciēt Fathers,
as vve read of one reiectēd by *Saint
Ambrose* in *Milayne*, vpon the yeare
of Christ 286. vwhen *Auxentius* the
Arrian-Bishopp, being puffed vp
vwith pride & arrogancy, by the fa-
uour of the Empresse *Iustina*, infe-
ctēd vwith the same heresy, had not
only prouoked *S. Ambrose* to pu-
blike

Publike
disputa-
tion refus-
ed by
S. Ambros.
vpon iust
causes.

of the like disputation, but had further
 l the procured that *Valentinian* the yong
 n his Emperour, being yet a child, & not
 baptized but only *Cathecumenus*,
 e ex- did make a publike edict, to com-
 ight maund the said disputations to be
 s in held vpo such a day, in his publike
 ymes court or consistorie, before him-
 when selfe & the said Empreſſe, certaine
 quall learned Pagans and Ievves being
 nue- appointed for iudges in that mat-
 try- ter. But *S. Ambrose*, by the counsell
 her- of diuers Bishoppes gathered togea-
 , & ther vvith him, refused to come to
 ers, those disputatiōs, vvryting a booke
 Saint to the Emperour *Valentinian* for his
 eare excuse, shewinge the iniustice and
 the vnequality of the order, and of
 l vp those tymes, and persuadinge him
 e fa- to recall the said lawv. And yf he
 nfe- vvould haue that controuerſie in
 not religion, betvveene them and the
 pu- *Arrians*, treated againe, he should
 like follow

Ambros.
 epist. 31.
 vvhere is
 extant
 also the
 booke
 sent by
Ambrose
 to *Valen-*
tinian.

Paul. in
vita Am-
brofij.

follovv therein the excellent ex-
ample of his predeceffor *Constan-*
tine the great, vvho fuffered Priests
and Bifhopps only to handle that
matter in the Councell of *Nice*, and
fo vvvas this difputation broken off
& presently there happened a thing
of great admiratiō (faith *Paulinus* in
the life of *S. Ambrofe*) vvwhich vvvas,
that a certaine principall learned
Arrian, *acerrimus difputator*; &
inconuertibilis ad fidem Catholicam,
being a moft eager difputer, and
effeemed not poffible to be con-
uerred to the Catholike faith; being
deceaued, at it feemeth, of his hope
and expectation to difpute in this
conflict, vvvent to the Church, to
heare at leaft vvhat *Ambrofe* could
fay out of the pulpit in his fermons:
vvhere feing an Angell to fpeake as
it vvvere in his care, he vvvas by that
miracle not only conuerted to be a

Ca-

ex Catholike, but became also a most
vehement defendor of that faith a-
gainst the heretiks.

10. To returne then to our purpose
of disputation, yt is of great mo-
ment, hovv, and in vvhat tyme and
place, and vvith vvhat lavves and
conditions they are made, vvherof
yovv vvill see the prooffe and expe-
rience also in these ten, that heere
we are to present; vvherof six being
held vnder the gouernemēt of Pro-
testants, and 4. vnder Catholike
magistrates, yovv shall see com-
plaints on both sides of inequality
offred: but he that shall read and con-
sider them indifferently, and vvith-
out passion, euen as they are sett
dovvne by Fox himselfe (for vve
could gett no other records therof
for the present) he shall easily see no
small differences to appeare. For
that the disputatiōs both at Oxford

the com-
parison
betwene
Cath. &
hereticall
disputa-
tions.

B

and

and *Cambridge* in K. Henryes dayes, vvere only certaine ostentations of light skyrmisses a farre of, so vainly and fondly performed, as they haue no substance in them at all. And so he vwill see that shall read these examinations. The other vnder *Queene Mary*, though the first of them in the conuocation-house, vwherin Protestants only vvere opponents, vvas not much vnlike the former for substāce, or rather lacke of substance: yet the other three held in *Oxford* against *Cranmer*, *Ridley* and *Latymer* by Catholike disputers, are of a farre different kynd, as hauinge both iudges, notaries, and arbitrators to the likinge of both parts appointed. And albeit in the manner of vrginge arguments, there vwant not complaints of the Protestant party, as after yovv shall heare: for that di-

uers somtymes are said to haue spoken together, & one man to haue putt himselfe into the prosecution of another mans argument, somewhat disorderly as to them yt seemed: yet touchinge the thinges themselves, to vvit the arguments & proofes there laid forth & prosecuted, there vvere so many cleere, substantiall & vveighty, as the reader vvill cōfesse there vvas no tyme lost in those 3. dayes disputation of the Cath. party. And so to the examination therof I remitt me.

One thing of no small importance there is to be cōsidered in this preface about the nature of disputation; to vvitt, that as it is a fit meanes to styrr vp mans vnderstandinge to attēd the truth, by layinge forth the difficultyes on both sides; so is yt not alvvayes sufficient to resolve his iudgement, for that yt

Disputation
fitter
in some
to moue
doubts &
examine
the truth,
then to
resolve
the same,

moueth more doubts then he can
aunsvvere or dissolue. And this
happeneth not only in vnlearned
people, vvhich by no meanes can
descerne vvhich party hath the bet-
ter, vvhhen both parts are learned &
allege arguments for themselues,
in matters aboue their capacity, but
euen the most learned also, yf they
haue no other meanes of resolu-
tion then arguing to and fro by di-
sputation, are brought many-times
to be more doubtfull therby then
before, & this euen in matters both
naturall and morall of this life. The
reason vvhherof is, that mans vnder-
standinge being limited, and the
light of knowvledge imparted vnto
him from God, being but a little
particle or sparkle of his infinite di-
uine knowvledge: yt cometh to
passe, that the more this sparkle is
exercised, & inkendled in searching

out

out Gods vvorks and secrers in this life, the more yt seeth her ovvne vweaknes, and beginneth to doubt more, & to be more ambiguous in herselfe, vvwhether that vvwhich shee apprehendeth be truly apprehended or no, or vvwhether by further search shee shall not find it othervvise, and see herselfe deceaued in this apprehensiō, as she hath found in many other apprehensions that vvvent before, vvhen she had lesse knowvledge.

12. And vpon this ground no doubt came those philosophers, called the *Academicks*, to found their sect & profession, that they vvould beleeue or affirme nothing, but dispute of all things to and fro vvithout assent. And heere hence came also the sayinge of that other philosopher: *Hoc vnum scio, me nihil scire.* I knowv only this, that I knowv no-

thinge. And *S. Austen* himselfe before his conuersion, being yet a *Manichee*, & vvearyed out vvith this search by vvay of arguments to and fro, vvhich should be the true Religion (for this vvvas one of their principall grounds, as himselfe testified, to belecue nothinge, but that vvhich vvvas euident by reason) fell at length to forsake the *Manichees*, & to ioyne himselfe to the Academiks: but after long search finding no certainty also therin, and hearing their sect euery day impugned by *S. Ambrose* Bishopp of Millayne (vvhere then *Augustine* remayned) he returned in the end by the motion of almighty God, to consider vvhat more grounds the Catholike Religion had, to stay a mans iudgement or conscience, then the vncertainty of disputations, and findinge the same, resolved himselfe to renounce

Aug. l. de moribus Ecclesie contra Manicheos.

Aug. confess. lib. 5. cap. 13. & lib. 6. c. 1. 2. 11.

all

all sects and to be a Catholike, as in his ovvne confessions at large he declareth. — — —

13. By this then vve do see, that albeit disputation rightly vsed, be a good meanes to discover truth by mouinge doubts to and fro, yet is yt not alvvayes sufficient to resolue and quiett a mans iudgement, euen in naturall thinges: and yf not in these, hovv much lesse in supernaturall and diuine, vvherin humane disputation hath farre lesse force? For that humane sciences, deducing their disputation from principles that are evidently knowvne vnto vs by light of nature, may farre better resolue a man by force of those disputations, and enforce him to yeld his assent, then in matters of diuinity, vvhere the first grounds and principles, are not knowvne to vs by light of nature,

vvhat force disputation hath in resolving matters of faith.

as in humane sciences, but are received only by light of faith, & received from God: vvhherfore these disputations may serue to examine and discusse matters, for stirring vp our vnderstanding, but the resolution & determination, must come from a more certaine meanes vvhich is infallible, and this vve see practised in the very first cōtrouerſy, that euer vvas handled in the priuatiue Church, as is recorded by S. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, vvhether Christiāns conuerted of gentills, should be bound to the obseruation of the mosayicall lawv or no? there vvas (saith the text) first *magna conquisitio*, a great search or disputation about the matter; and then secondly the Apostles declared their sentences in order, and finally the determination vvas in all their names, representing

Act. 15.

The manner of
proceeding vnder
the Apostles.

representing the vvhole Church, *visum est spiritui sancto & nobis*, yt seemed good to the holy-ghost and vs, and so vvas the matter determined, and the like forme hath byn obserued euer since that tyme in the Cath. Church, determining all cōtrouersies that haue fallen out, to vvith, that first there should be great search & discussion of the matter, by lawfull and free disputation, to vvich end the most learned men of all nations are sent cōmonly to generall Councils, to performe this point. And secondly all argumētson beth sides being heard & examined, the Bishops presēt do giue their voices, and accordinge to the greater part, vvith concurrence & generall approbation of the generall head, do they determine *visum est spiritui sancto & nobis*. So as heere disputatiō serueth not to determine but to examine.

The wāt
which ses
ctayes
haue to
deter-
myne
matters
by Cicero
in Para-
dox.

14. And for that the sectaryes of our dayes haue not this sound meane to determyne matters, but do depend only vpon probability, and persuasibility of speach, or vvyrtuing one against the other, by which (as Tully saith) *nothinge is so incredible, that may not be made probable*: therefore are their questions and controuerfies endlesse and indeterminate; and though they haue had aboue a hundred meetings, conferences, disputations, Councells and synods from their first disputation held at *Lyppsia*, vpon the yeare 1519. vnto their synodde in *Vilna*, vpon the yeare 1590. vvhreeof yovv may see more largely in *Stanislaus Rescius* his obseruations: yet could they neuer agree, nor vwill hereafter, lackinge the forsaide meanes of resolution and determination vpon their disputations.

15. And

our
ane
de-
and
ry-
hich
ible,
ner-
on-
mi-
had
nfe-
and
ion
19.
oon
may
scius
hey
lac-
olu-
heir
And

is. And yf this do fall out euen in
the learnedst of our sectaryes, that
they cannot by disputations alone
resolue soundly cyther themselues,
or others in matters of cōtrouerfy,
for that still there remaine doubts
and difficultyes, vvhether matters
vvere vvell prosecuted or no; and
nevv arguments do offer them-
selues dayly to and fro: vyhat shall
vve thinke of the vnlearned and
ignorant people, that cannot vn-
derstand that is argued, and much
lesse iudge therof? and yet vpon
the creditt of such disputations do
aduenture their foules, as yovv
haue seene by many lamentable ex-
amples before in both mē & vveo-
men, that vpon the fame & creditt
of these English disputations heere
sett downe by Fox, partlie vnder
K. Edward, & partlie vnder *Queene*
Mary, and vpon the probabilitie of
some

the will-
fulnes of
Foxian
vnlearn-
ned lectas-
ries in
disputa-
tion.

*Mensis
Ian. Mart.
Sept. &
Novemb.

some fond and broken arguments
vsed therin for the Protestants side,
as somevvhath apparant & plaufible
to their senses & capacity, haue not
only stood therin most arrogantly
against their Bishoppes, and learned
Pastors by open disputatiōs in their
Courts and Consistoryes, but haue
runne also to the fire for the same,
vvherof *Allerton, Tankerfield, Crash-*
field, Fortune, and others * before
mentioned being but *Cooks, Carpen-*
ters, and Coblars by occupation: yea
vveomen also as *Anne Alebright, Alice*
Potkins, Ioan Lashford, Alice Dryuer,
and others may be ridiculous but
lamentable examples.

16. Neither is this a newv or strange
thing, that hereticall vveomen
should growv to such insolency, as
to stand in disputation vvith the
learnedst Bishops of the Catholike
side, for that vve read it recorded in

Eccle-

Ecclesiasticall historyes aboute 12.

The story
of a Mas
sanean
woman
that dis
puted
with a
Bishopp.

hundred yeares gone, to vvitt vpon
the yeare of Christ 403. that a cer-
tayne vvillfull vvoman of the cit-
ty of *Antioch* named *Iulia*, infected
vvith the abhominable heresie of
the *Manichees* and feruent therein,
camè vnto the citty of *Gaza*, vvher-
of *S. Porphyrius* a holy learned man
vvas Bishopp, & beginning there to
peruert diuers Christians, & being
for the same reprehended by the
Bishopp, she contemned him, yea
challenged him to open disputatiō,
vvhich the good man admittinge,
she behaued herselfe so insolently
therein as vvvas intolerable: So as
vvhen he had suffered her a great
vvhile to alleage her blasphemous
arguments, & could by no meanes
reduce her or make her harken to
the truth, he fell from disputation
to vse another meane, turning him-
selfe

Marcus in
vita S.
Porphirij.

selfe to God, sayinge: O Eternall
God vvhich hast created all thinges, and
art only eternall, hauinge no beginnunge
or endinge, vvho art glorified in the
blessed Trinitie, strike this vvomans
tongue, and stopp her mouth that she
speake no more blasphemyes against
thee. VVhich vvords being vttered,
Iulia began to stammer, and to
change countenance, fallinge into
an extasis, and so leefing her voyce,
remained dumme vntill she died,
vvhich vvvas soone after, vvherat
tvvo men and tvvo vveomen that
came vvith her fell dovvne at the
Bishoppes feete askinge pardon, and
vvere conuerted, as vvere diuers
gentills also by the same miracle.

17. And this vvvas the conclusion
of that disputation; and though it
pleased not almightie God to vse
the like miracles externallie in Qu.
Maryes dayes, for the repressinge of
those

those insolēt vveomen that disputed so malepartlie, and vttered so manie blasphemous speeches against the soueraigne misterie of Christs reall presence in the Sacrament; yet can there be no great doubt, but that inuwardlie he vsed the same, or no lesse iustice vnto them, especiallie seing he suffered them to go to the fire all vvithout repentance, and so to perish both bodilie and ghostlie, temporallie and eternallie. And for that in recytinge their storyes before sett dovvne, intendinge all breuitie possible, I could not conuenientlie lay forth their seuerall arguments in disputation, as neyther of those that vv ere their maisters and inducers to this maddnes; I haue thought good heere to examine all togeather in this *Re-vieuw*, vvhereby yovv shall see vvhat grounds

The
cause of
the Edition
of
these
disputations.

grounds they had of so great an enterprise, and of so obstinate a prosecution therof. And this shall suffice by vway of *Preface*: Nowv vwill vve passe to the recytall of the said disputations.

O F

About
co

Besid

N

public
the ch
Religi
rey w
and th
great p
all tho
colloq
ment

OF TEN PVBLIKE DISPV TATIONS,

*Recounted by Iohn Fox, to haue
byn held in England,*

About Controuerfies in Religion, especially
concerning rhe blessed Sacrament of the
Altar, within the space of 4. yeares,
at two feuerall changes of Re-
ligion, vnder K Edward,
and Queene Mary;

*Besides many other more particular, held in Bishops
Consistoryes, and other places, about
the same matters.*

C H A P. I.

N O V V then to come more neere to the
matter yt selfe, we are breefly to re-
count the forsaide ten disputations, or
publike meetinges and conferences, that after
the change of the ourward face of Catholike
Religion in England, were held in our coun-
trei within the space only of 4. or 5. yeares,
and the effects that ensued thereof, which in
great part were not vnlike to the successe of
all those disputations, meetings, conferences,
colloquies and other attempts of triall before
mentioned, to haue ben with little profit of
agree-

agreement, made in Germany, Polony, France and other places amongst the Protestants of this age, since the beginning of their new ghospell, the causes and reasons wherof, haue in part ben touched by vs in our precedent preface, and shall better appeare after ward by the examination of these ten publike disputatiōs, from which, as from generall storehouses, or head schooles, were borrowed the armour & arguments, for these other lesser bickerings of particular Foxian Martyrs, which they had with their Bishops, Prelates & Pastors at their examinations & arraignemēts, vpon the confidence & pride wherof, they were induced to offer themselues most obstinately & pittifully vnto the fire, as in th'exame of *John Fox* his Calendar, you haue seene abundantly declared.

First Disputation. §. 1.

First dis-
putation
of Peter
Martyr at
Oxford.
1549.

2. Wherefore to recount the particulars as breisely as we may, the first publike disputation of these ten, wherof we now are to treat, was held at Oxford against the *real presence* of the blessed body & bloud of our Saviour in the Sacrament of the Altar, by *Peter Martyr* an Italian Apostata friar, vpon the yeare of Christ (as Fox setteth it downe) 1549. which was the third of *K. Edward* the sixt his raigne, about the moneth of *Iune* (for he expresseth not the very day) and the cheife moderator or iudge in this disputation, was *D. Cox* Chancelour at that

ryme

tyme of the vniuersity; but after vnder Q. Elizabeth was B. of Ely, and his assistants were Henry B. of Lincolne, Dr. Haynes deane of Exeter; M. Richard Marison Esquier, and Christophor Ne-
Fox pag.
1249.

g. For better vnderstandinge wherof yow must note, that albeit K. Edward had reigned now more then full two yeares, and that the protector Seymer and some others of his humour, would haue had change of doctrine established euen at the beginninge, about the point of the blessed Sacrament; yet could they not obtayne it in Parlamēt, partly, for that the farre greater part of the realme was yet against it, but especially for that it was not yet resolved by the Archbishopp Cranmer himselfe, of whome if you remember, Iohn Fox doth com-
Fox pag.
1115. &
1205.

plaine in one place vnder K. Henry; that good Cranmer had not yet a full feelinge of that doctrine. Whervpon we see, that in the first parliament of K. Edwards tyme, begon vpon the 4. of November & ended vpon the 14. of December 1547. there was an act made with this title. An act against such persons, as shall vnreuerently speake against the Sacrament of the body and bloud of Christ, &c. Wherin magnificent words are spoken of this Sacrament, and all those greatly reprehended, that in their sermons, preachings, readings, talks, rymes, songes, playes, or gestures, did name and call yt, by such vile and vnseemely words (saith the Statute) as Christian eares did abhorre to heare yt rehearsed;

See Statut.
booke an.
1. Edw. 6.
cap. 1.

Fox pag.
1548.

Zuin-
nisse ad-
mitted.
1546.

* Sup. De-
cemb. 26.

See Doctor
Saunders l.
2. de schism.
Angl.

1. Cor. 12.

The dif-
ferencing
of Peter
Martyr &
Bucer.

and this was the the first spirit of that Calu-
nian humor in England, misliked by *Cranmer*
and the rest at that tyme, but soone after al-
lowed well by *John Fox* in such of his Martyrs,
as call yt *wormes-meate*, *idoll*, and the like.

4. And finally this party so much preuayled
with them that gouerned, as not longe after,
that is to say, in the second parlament begone
the 4. of Nouember 1548. and ended the 14.
of March 1549. they gott their new commu-
nion booke to be admitted, wherein their new
doctrin also against the *reall presence* was con-
teyned, and then *Peter Martyr*, who, as in his
story we haue * shewed, was sent to Oxford
before with indifferēcy, to teach what should
be ordeyned him from higher powers in that
parlament, hauing expected all the lent long,
whilst the parlament endured, what would
be decreed about this point; and finding him-
selfe in straytes, for that he was come to the
place of *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, where he
must needs declare himselfe, receauinge now
aduertisement of the new decree, did not only
accomodate himselfe to teach and preach the
same doctrine presently: (which yet the other
friar, his companion *Martyn Bucer* would not
doe in Cambridge) but also was content vpon
request & order from the Councell, to defend
the same in publike disputations, for better
authorizinge yt through the whole body of
the realme. This then was the occasion of this
first publike disputation, to giue some counte-
nance and creditt to the new receaued opi-
nion

nion

nion and paradox of Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, and Carolstadius, three schollers of Luther himselfe, against the *reall presence*, which as often yow haue heard before, Luther did condemne for damnable heresie, and them for heretiks that mayntayned yr.

Luth. lib.
cont Sacra-
ment. &
alibi saepe.

5. The questions chosen by Peter Martyr were three: First about Transubstantiation, *whether after the words of consecration, the bread and wyne be turned into the body and bloud of Christ.* The second about the *reall presence*; *whether the body and bloud of Christ be carnally and corporally (for so are his words) in the bread and wyne, or otherwise vnder the kinds of bread and wyne.* The third was: *whether the body and bloud of Christ be vnited to bread Sacramentally?* But of this last question Fox relateth nothing, that yt was eyther handled or touched in this disputation. About the former two, this manifest fraud was vsed, that wheras the first about Transubstantiation, depended on the second of the *reall presence*, it should haue byn handled in the second place, and not in the first, as heere yt is; for cleerer conceauing wherof, the Reader must note, that the mayne controuersie betweene the Sacramentaries & vs, is about the *reall presence*, to witt whether the true body of Christ be really and substantially in the Sacrament after the words of consecration, which we do hould affirmatiuely, and so doth Luther also, & then supposing that it is so, there followeth a second question *de modo essendi*, of the manner of Christs being there, to witt, whether yt be there together

Three
questions
to be dis-
puted at
Oxford
1549.

See the
defence of
the relatiō
of *Plessis*
his dispu-
tation
vvith B.
Peron of
Eureux
book 2 part.
3 of our
three con-
uerſions,

gether with bread, or without bread, or whether the bread be annihilated by the presence of Christs body, or whether yt be turned into the very substance of Christs body, as we haue shewed out of *Scotus* and *Durand* before, in the discussion of *Plessis Mornay* his Triall; and eue-ry one of these opinions, about the manner of Christs being there, do presuppose the *reall presence*, denied by the Sacramentaryes: So as to dispute first about this particular manner of Christ his being there by *Transubstantiation*, before yt be discussed whether he be really there or noe, ys to sett the cart before the horse, and the foote before the head.

6. And yet for that they do persuaide themselves, that they haue some more shifts or shewes of probability against *Transubstantiation*, then against the *reall presence*, or can delude better our arguments in the simple peoples eyes, they alwayes runne to this, & leaue the other: And it is, as if the question being, first whether gold were in a purse, & then whether yt were there alone or els together with ledd, tynne, or some such baser mettall; some wrangler would first dispute the second question before the first; or as if two demaunds being propounded, first whether in such a vessell (where water was knowne to be before) there be wine put in, and secondly whether this wine haue turned that water into it selfe or noe? or that water & wine do remaine together, and that one would pretermit the first questiō, to witt, *whether wine be really & truly there or no?* and cauld only

only about the second, whether the water be turned into wine, or remaine together with the wine? In which cases yow see first, that this manner of dealinge were preposterous and impertinent wrangling, but especially, yf the wrangler did deny expressly that there was any gold at all in the purse, or wine in the vessell, for then yt were too too much folly for him to dispute the secondary questions whether the said gold were there alone, or with other mettalles; or whether the wine had couerted the water into it selfe or no; for yf neither gold nor wine be really there presēt, then is there no place for the secōd dispute at all. And so fareth it in our cōtrouersy of the *reall presence* of Christs body. For if the said body be not really & substāially in the Sacramēt at all, as the *Zuinglians* & *Caluinists* do hould; then is it impertinēt for them to dispute the second question, whether it be there without bread or with bread, or whether bread be turned into it or no by *Trāsubstantiation*, for so much as they suppose it not to be there at all; only *Luther* & *Lutherans* may haue cōtrouersy with Catholiks, about the māner how it is there, seing they beleuee it to be there in deed; but *Zuingliāns* & *Caluinists* cānot, but only about the first question, whether it be there or noe; which question notwithstanding, for so much as they fly and runne alwayes to the second, as we haue shewed; notorious it is that they runne frō the purpose, & shew theselues not only wrāglers but also deceauers, seeking to dazell the eyes of the simple in this behalfe,

Two similitudes to expresse the wayne vntāgling of Sacramētaries about Transubstantiatio.

as in this first disputation at Oxford, *Peter Martyr* begon with Transubstantiation, and was much longer therein, then in the controuersie of the reall presence.

Fraudulēt
dealing of
Protestāts,
in dispu-
tation.

7. And in the second disputation of *B. Ridley* in Cambridge, two only questions being proposed; the first was by preposterous order of Transubstantiation, and the second of the Sacrifice, but the reall presence was wholly omittred, and the like in the fourth disputation vnder *Maister Pearne* for the Protestants, as after yow shall see. And when lastly *Maister Ridley* came to resolve vpon all three disputations, held vnder him in Cambridge, and the questions handled therein, he quite passeth ouer the controuersie of reall presence. And so yow shall obserue the like trickes in most of the other disputations, and yet (as I say) yf there be no reall presence, the question of Transubstantiation hath no place at all, no nor the sacrifice neyther, as *Ridley* confesseth in his said resolution, and this for the first shifte of *Peter Martyr* & his fellowes in this disputation.

Fox pag.
1349.

3. fraud.

8. The second shifte is, that he putteth downe fraudulently the second question about the reall presence, whether the body of Christ be there carnally or corporally, for albeit we do hold that both *Caro & Corpus*, which is the flesh and body of Christ our Sauour, be there truly and really, yet not after a fleshely and corporall manner, as these words seeme to import, but rather Sacramentally, that is to say though truly, and really, yet after a Sacramen-

reall and spirituall manner, euen as our soule is in our body, and an Angell in a corporall place. And albeit sonie authors and Fathers do vse sometymes the word *Corporaliter*, speakinge of the reall presence, yet so Fox and Martyr maliciously euery where call yt a carnall and corporall presence, therby to deceaue the simple reader, as though yt were there with locall dimensions, after the manner of other bodyes, and not after a spirituall manner of being.

See after-
ward 4. 3.

9. The third fraude in settinge downe this first disputation is, that wheras Fox doth tell ys in this place, that the principall disputers against *Peter Martyr* were *Doctor Tressam*, *Doctor Chadsey*, and *Maister Morgan*, yet doth he not tell ys one word what they said against him, nor doth he relate any one of their arguments or answers, but only the arguments of *Peter Martyr* against them with triumph, as who would say, he had gotten the victory without resistance: but yow shall see in the ensuing Chapters, what manner of arguments *Peter Martyrs* were, and how easy to be answered, as no doubt but they were by them, yf Fox had thought good to haue related both parts (as he ought to haue done) or haue left both parts out. But this is his ordinary custome of dealing. Wherefore that you may vnderstand partly how the matter went in deed, by the relation of one that was present, to witt *D. Saunders*, I will set downe breiefely his words of the action in generall, as yt passed. Thus then he wryteth about this first *Oxford* disputation.

Fox pag.
ibid.

3. fraud.

Sand 1 b. 2.
de schism.
Angl.

10. *Petrus Martyr* (saith he) &c. *Peter Martyr*, of whome many of the Sectaryes promised to themselves great matters, for that he was publike reader in *Oxford*, being challenged in those dayes by many of that vniuersity, to defend his doctrine by disputation, and namely by *D. Rich. Smyth* who had byn his predecessor in the same chaire, neuer durst to yeld therunto, vntill he had obtayned that *D. Cox* a sectary of his owne side, and a man of very loose life should be sent from the court, to be moderator and iudge in the same disputation: And that *D. Smith* was called from the vniuersity, &c. But when the said disputation had endured for three dayes, and that *Cox* had seene his *Peter Martyr* much more pressed then he looked for, and almost hissed out of the schooles by all the schollers and hearers, he was forced to say that he was sent for away in all hast to London, & consequently could no longer attend to these disputes. Wherefore hauing giuen great praises publicely to *Peter Martyr*, and admonished the schollers to keep peace, he brake vp those disputations, & so departed with infamy in the sight of all men: yet *Peter Martyr* afterward set forth these disputations fraudulently, as heretiks are accustomed, and would needs seeme to haue had the victory, but by the iudgment of that vniuersity he was twise vanquished, first in that he durst not encounter *D. Smith*, & secondly for that he could not answer the arguments of the other Cath. Doctors. Thus he. Wherby we may perceau. the

D. Saunders
relation of
this di-
sputation
at *Oxford*.

reason

reason wherfore Fox would not set downe at length the particulars of this first disputation at Oxford, as he did of some of the others after.

Second Disputation. §. 2.

11. The second disputation was held at Cambridge about the same tyme (saith Fox) to witt vpon the 20. of Iune anno 1549. the defendant for the Protestant side was D. Madeiv; the opponents D. Glyn, M. Langdale, M. Sedgewike, and M. Yonge, the moderator was D. Ridley B. of Rochester at that time, but soone after of London by deprivation of D. Bonner. The commissioners sent from the King to assise as iudges, besides the said Nicolas Ridley, were Thomas B. of Ely, Syr Iohn Cheke schoolmaister to the King, a forward Protestant in those daies, though vnder Q. Mary he left them, D. May a Ciuilian, and D. Vvenday the Kings phisition. The questiōs disputed were two, as before hath byn said. The first, *whether there were any Transubstantiation & the second, whether there be any externall & propitiatory sacrifice in the masse.* The question of the *reall presence*, wherof both these do depend, was not handled at all, for the causes yow must thinke before mentioned, and he that shall read ouer this whole disputation, shall find it a very cold & trifling thing, much of the time being spent in ceremoniall words of courtesy, much in impertinēt excursions frō the purpose, out of all scholasticall forme of disputing or straying the defendant, & when any thing drew neere

The second disputation held by D. Ridley in Cambridge.

Trifling disputation of our first Protestants,

to

Fox pag.
1254

to vrge or presse, eyther the moderator would diuert the same by intrudinge himselfe, or the proctors by their authority would interrupt yt. Heere (saith Fox) the proctors commaunded the opponent to diuerte, &c. And againe, heere the proctors commaunded Langdale to giue place to another. And further; heere he was commaunded to reply in the second matter. And yet further, heere M. Sedgewike was commaunded to cease to Maister Tonge. Which Tonge, hauinge scarce made three instances in prooffe of the Sacrifice against Ridley, ended all the disputations with these words: VVell I am contented, and do most humbly beseech your good Lordshipp, to pardon me of my great rudenesse & imbecillity, vvhich I haue heere shewed, &c. Which indeed sheweth great imbecillity, yf he said so indeed, and that Fox hath not made him to speake as best pleaseth himselfe.

Fox pag.
1255

Fox noteth the disagreement of his owne men.

12. I could alleage diuers other simplicities out of this disputation, yf I would stand vpon them, yea on the part of Fox and Ridley themselves; for in one place Fox maketh this note vpon a certayne answer of Ridley: Heere is to be noted (saith he) that Peter Martyr in his answer at Oxford, did graunt a change in the substances of bread and wyne, vvhich in Cambridge by the Bishopp Doctor Ridley vvas denyed. Behould heere the goodly agreement, that was betweene the first founders of Sacramentaryes doctrine in England, and how worthy to be noted by themselves. Friar Martyr in Oxford graunted a change in the substances themselves of bread and wyne, by the words of consecration; but Bishop Ridley in

Cam-

Cambridge denieth the same, so great difference is there betweene Oxford and Cambridge, the Friar and the Bishoppe: and is not he well holpen vp that hangeth his soule on these mens opinions? this then is one simplicity of Fox, but lett vs heare another of Ridley related by Fox his owne pen, in his answer to Maister Sedgewicke, who began thus.

13. Right VVorshippfull Maister Doctor I do aske of you first of all, whether the Greeke article (this being of the neuter gender, be referred to the vword (bread) or to the word (body)? to the first yt cannot be, for that it is of the masculine gender, ergo to the second. This was the obiection or demaund, lett vs heare the Bishoppes solution. Forsooth (saith he) that article is referred to neyther of both, but may signifie vnto vs any other kind of things. Thus the Bishoppe. So as by this exposition, Christ might as well signifie a staffe, or a stoole, or any garment or thing that lay on the table, or whatsoever els any man will diuise, as well as bread, or his body, when he said of bread, *this is my body*. And is not this a Bishopplike aunswere? But of the arguments and aunswers of this second disputation, we shall haue occasion to speake afterwards, when the controuerxies themselves shalbe discussed in particular, and so we shall passe forward to recount the other disputations that ensue.

Ridleyes
fond aun-
sweringe.

Fox pag.
1256.]

Third Disputation. §. 3.

The 3. disputation
at Cambridge anno
Domini 1549.

14. The third disputation was held at Cambridge vpon the 23. of Iune in the same yeare 1549. as Fox recounteth, wherin two propositions were held affirmatiuely for the Catholiks, by the aforesaid D. Glyn defendant, to witt for the reall presence & sacrifice of the masse. The opponents for the Protestants were M. Perne, M. Gryndall B. afterwards of London, and Canterbury, M. Ghest and M. Pilkinton, which last vnder Q. Elizabeth gott the Bishopricke of Durham. The moderator and iudges were the same as in the former disputation, to witt Ridley and his fellowes, and the manner and forme not much vnlike, though somewhat more disorderly, each one putting in his verdict to and fro at his pleasure. But yet whosoever shall peruse the same vvith equality, will easily perceauē an eminent difference for learninge, discretion and clere aunsweringe betweene the said Doctor Glyn and his opponents, which principally is to be attributed to the difference of his cause from theirs; they neuer prosecuting commonly one *medium* for aboue one or two instances, but leaping presently to another: so graue and substantiall a disputation was this for poore people that heard yt, or heard of yt, and followed the resolution therein sett downe, to hange their soules vpon the certaynty therof.

Maister

15. Maister Perne beginneth with a complaint, against D. Glyn, that he had left Transubstantiation & taken vpon him to defend the reall presence in the Sacrament, *vyheras we deny nothinge lesse* (saith he) *then his corporall presence or absence of his substance in the bread.* Wherby yt is evidently seene, that Maister Perne was not of Ridleyes opinion, but held the reall presence, though with Luther perhaps he did not beleue Transubstantiation: and this is euident by his arguments which after he vsed, nothinge in deed against the reall presence, but only to proue that Christ his body was rogeather with bread. The like manner of impertinent dealinge vsed Ridley himselfe in diuers of his arguments; as for example: *this is that bread* (saith he) *which came downe from heauen, ergo, yt is not Christs body, for that his body came not from heauen:* which proueth also that yt was not bread, for that Ridley will not say (I thinke) that the materiall bread which Christ had in his hand, came owne from heauen. The like argument vseth Pilkington thus: *vyher soeuer* (saith he) *Christ is, there be his ministers also, for so he promised: but Christ as you hold is in the Sacrament, ergo his ministers are there also.* Which were a foule incōuenience as you see, if all our English ministers should be in the Sacrament for the poore people to byre at. And yet this argument seemeth so graue vnto Iohn Fox, as he maketh this marginall note thereon. *Where Christ is, there are his ministers.* And the poore fellow hath not so much witt, as to see that those words of Christ were meant of

D. Perne
confesseth
the corporall
presence
of Christ
in the Sacrament.

Fox pag.
1257.

Fond arguments
of Sacramentaries.

of his glory in the life to come, and not of the Sacrament which is ministred vpon earth.

16. But to the end yow may the better perceaue, how disorderly this and the former disputation at Cambridge, was made by the new Protestants to ouerbeare the Catholike cause, I shall sett downe some lynes of a narration of D. Langdale, Archdeacon of Chichester, a Cambridge man who was present at the said disputation, and confuted afterward in print the said Ridleys determination vpon these disputations. Thus then he wryteth: *Vix dum finita Collegiorum visitatione, &c.* The Colledges of Cambridge were no sooner visited by the Kinges Commissioners, but there appeared

*Albanus
Langlandus
in confut.
Determ.
Niccol. Ridley.*

„ vpon all the gates two conclusions set vp, the
„ first against *Transubstantiation*, the other against
„ the sacrifice of the masse, and presently the bedells
„ of the vniuersity went about to giue warning,
„ that yf any man had any thinge to say against
„ these conclusions, he should come forth the
„ third day after, (which was *Corpus-Christi* day,)
„ to dispute, or otherwise all to be bound to
„ perpetuall silence for euer after. The con-
„ course of noble men, & all other degrees was
„ great, and scaffolds made for the place of di-
„ sputation, that the multitude might the better
„ heare: but all that were indifferent, did see
„ matters to be handled with great inequality;
„ for that whosoever spake for the Catholike
„ side presently his speech was eyther interrup-
„ ted, or for breuity shifted of to another tyme,
„ and Ridley that was the Captayne of all steps

pinge

bing in at euery turne to asist his defendant, ,,
 did eyther with threatēs or fayre words, or by ,,
 scoffes and bytter taunts seeke to diuert the ,,
 Catholike disputers. ,,
 17. And when the first dayes disputation ,,
 was in this manner ended, yt was denounced ,,
 to the auditory, before the dismission of the ,,
 schooles, that yf any man would come forth The par-
 and defend within a day or two, the Catho- tall dea-
 like parte of those questions, he might, but lingē of
 afterwards it should not be lawfull for any man Protestāts
 to speake therof: which vnexpected denun- in their
 tiation being heard, one man looked vpon disputa-
 another, and all for a tyme were silent, vntill tions.
 at length a most learned and graue man, pious
 and skillfull, as well in knowledge of the
 tongues, as also in diuinity, wherof he had
 byn there publike reader before (to witt Do-
 ktor Glyn) stept forth and offered himselfe to
 the combatt, and performed yt the third day
 after, takinge the place of defendant without
 help of any moderator, but all rather against
 him, beginning his declaration, (which Cam-
 bridge men call his *position*) with the words of
 the Prophett: *Credidi propter quod locutus sum.* Psalms. 115.
 And the Protestants were so vrged in these
 disputations about the *reall presence*, that not-
 withstandinge they auoyded and dissembled
 that question so much as they could, yet were
 they driuen to such shifts, to putt of the cleere
 places & authorities of ancient Fathers about
 the same, as was ridiculous to heare; for that
 sometymes they said Christs body was present

D in the

„ in the Sacrament by signification, then by re-
 „ presentation, then by meditation, then by ap-
 „ pellation, sometymes by propriety, other
 „ tymes by nature, then by power, then againe
 „ by grace, then by memory or remembrance,
 „ then by vertue & energy, and by many other
 „ diuises of deluding or shifting of the matter.
 „ All which being done, and another third day
 „ of disputation passed ouer in like manner,
 „ Ridley tooke vpon him to giue the determina-
 „ tion of all, as though he had gotten the victo-
 „ ry. Thus farre out of Doctor Langelands booke;
 „ wherby may be gathered how the matter
 „ passed in these disputations.

Fourth Disputation. §. 4.

The 4. di- 18. The fourth disputation was held also in
 sputation at Cam- Cambridge soone after the former, wherin, ac-
 bridge. cording to Fox his relation, the forsaide Maister
 3549. Perno was defendant for the Protestants, and
 the opponents for the Catholike part, were
 Maister Parker, Maister Pollard, Maister Vausour,
 Fox pag. and Maister Tonge: the moderator and iudges
 1257. was Maister Ridley of Rochester togeather with
 his fellowes aforementioned: the two que-
 stions were about *Transubstantiation*, and the
Sacrifice; the other of the *reall presence* was pre-
 termitted (accordinge to the former declared
 sleight) though yt were the principall and the
 ground, wheron these other two do depend,
 & concerneth the very substance of the *Zum-*
 glian

lian and Calvinian sect, now newly set vp and authorized by these disputations, and consequently should first and principally haue byn discusled, yf eyther good method or shew of true dealinge had byn obserued. But D. Perne the defendant beleeued the *reall presence*, as in the former disputation yow haue heard him protest, though in this disputation he sought to expound himselfe in these words: *I graunt that Christ is in the Sacrament truly, wholly and verily after a certayne property and manner. I deny not his presence, but his reall, and corporall presence.* But this is a difference without a diuersity (by M. Pernes licence) for yf Christs body be there *truly, wholly and verily*, he must also be there *really*, as to euery mans common sense and reason is euident; and so Maister Perne by this distinction sheweth, that he beleued nothing at all really, truly, or verily at that tyme, yf his heart were accordinge to his words.

19. And albeit, as I haue said, Maister Perne propoundeth the questions of *Transubstantiation & sacrifice of the masse*, yet when they came to ioyne issue, their speech was most of all about the *reall presence*, and I call yt a speech rather then disputation, for that yt had neyther order, method, nor substance in yt, but was a most ridiculous colloquy of one to another, without vrginge or answeringe any one argument substantially, but a little beagles lyng togeather, one starteth vp and giueth a barke or two, and lyeth downe againe; so these disputers, aunswerers, and moderator

D. Pernes speaketh doubtfully & doubly about the Sacramēt.

The fond manner of this disputation.

handled the matter; as for example, M. Parker being to argue first, began to alleage three wayne reasons (as Fox calleth them in the margent) for the reall presence, to witt, that y^e was prophesied, promised, and performed as he produced by diuers places of scripture, which being done Iohn Fox, without tellinge vs any answer at all giuen by Maister Perne, hath these words. *Heere they were forced to breake of through the want of tyme, yet Maister Parker replied thus with a prayer against Maister Perne; vve giue thee thanks most holy Father, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast reueyled them to babes, for pride is the roote of all heresies whatsoever, &c.*

Fox pag.
1260.

Contradi-
ction in
Fox his
words.

20. Now heere I vould aske Iohn Fox what he meaneth by this note; *that they were forced to breake of for lacke of tyme?* and yet that Parker replied, and began his reply with a prayer? For yf they brake of, how did he reply, especially his reply being somewhat long. And yf he replied in so large a manner as Fox setteth it downe, how did they breake off? & how ridiculous a thing is it, that a sollemne disputation being begon in presence of the whole vniuersity, and of so great an audience, and Maister Parker being the first opponent, the matter should be broken of without hearing any one answer of the defendant? But these are Fox his fooleryes, and these were the first and most firme foundations of our new Calvinian sect in England. Many other particulars might be sett downe, especially of Ridley's mode-

mode-

moderatinge, who at euery turne made him-
 selfe defendant & answered farre worse then
 Perne himsele, but we shall haue better occa-
 sion to touch the same afterward, when we
 shall examine more particularly what passed
 about euery controuerisie, in each of these di-
 sputations; only *Vauesout* of all the opponents
 seemeth to haue spoken best to the purpose
 (as Fox relateth him) for that he alleaged an
 authority of *S. Augustine* in Psalm. 98. which *Ri-*
dley, not able to answere, ridiculously shiftech
 of as yow shall see afterwards, when yt com-
 meth in ranke to be examined, and in his pre-
 face he cited two sayings of *Zuinglius* and *Oeco-*
lampadius, of their owne doubtfullnesse at the
 beginnunge, in the doctrine with they first
 broached against the reall presence. *Zuinglius*
 his words are: *Albeit this thinge that I meane to*
treat of, doth like me very well; yet notwithstandinge
I dare define nothings, but only shew my poore indige-
ment abroad to others, &c. *Oecolampadius* his words
 are wrytinge to his brother. *Peace be with thee.*
As farre as I can coniecture out of the ancient Fathers,
these words of Christ (this is my body) is a figura-
tive locution, &c. Thus they at the beginnunge
 very doubtfully, as yow see, but afterward, as
 those that tell lyes so often, as at length they
 beginne to beleeuē them to be true them-
 selues, so did these men; and yet others were
 so foolish as to follow them in their doubtfull
 fancies, a pittifull case in the cause of our
 soule. Well, *Iohn Fox* concludeth this whole
 disputation with these words: *Heere endeth*

M. Vauesout
four com-
mended.

Zuinglius
 and *Oeco-*
lampadius
 doubtfull
 of their
 doctrine
 at the be-
 ginninge.

Fox pag.
 1261.

Fifth Disputation. §. 5.

The 5. dis-
putation
or deter-
mination
at Cam-
bridge by
M. Ridley.

21. The fifth disputation was the publike determination made by B. Ridley, as iudge and moderator vpon the questions, before handled in the three disputations of Cambridge, vvhich determinatiō I do reckon among the number of the other disputations publike, and colloquyes, both for that yt was made vpon a seuerall day most sollemnely, and with no lesse concourse of people then the former, as also for that yt setteth downe all the heads of his principall arguments, as the first disputation doth those of Peter Martyr, though without the answers or replies of his aduersaryes. And indeed this being a collection of all the substantiall points, of whatsoeuer had byn alleaged by the Protestants in all three disputations, as also whatsoeuer himselfe could adde therunto; and being done with so great study & deliberation, as to be deliuered in the greatest concourse and expectation of people (for the nouelty therof) that euer perhaps were seene togeather in Cambridge before; yt being the first publike determination against the truth of Christs sacred body in the Sacramēt, that euer that vniuersity, from her first foundation had heard of: For all these reasons and respects (I say) this determination may per-
haps

haps be numbred amongst one of the most
sollemne conferences, or disputations held
by the Sacramentarye Protestants in our
countrey.

22. Ridley then began the assembly with these
words: There hath byn an ancient custome amange
you, that after disputatiōs had in your common schooles,
there should be some determination made of the matter
disputed and debated, especially touching Christian Re-
ligion; because therfore it is seene good to these worship-
full asistants, ioyned with me in commissiō from the
Kings Maiestie, that I should performe the same at this
tyme, I will by your fauourable patience declare, both
vyhat I do thinke and belecue my selfe, and what all
other ought to thinke of the same, vvhich I vould that
afterward ye did with diligence weigh and ponder, eue-
ry man at home seuerally by himselfe, &c. This is his
preface, wherin yow may note first, what a
different assurance it is for a man, to repose the
saluation of his soule vpon this new beleefe
and thinkinge of Maister Ridley, which was not
yet as yt seemeth full three or foure yeares old
with him (for vntill K. Henryes death he was
euer held of another opinion) or vpon the ge-
nerall determination, learninge, iudgement,
piety, & consent of the worthiest in the Chri-
stian world, assembled together in councells,
wherof ten, (as in our preface we haue tou-
ched, and shall againe afterward) had deter-
mined for the reall presence in the space of the
last 500. yeares, before this contrary determi-
nation of Ridley, to witt after the question was
once moued by Berengarius, vntill yt was mo-

Fox pag.
1261.

Ridley his
entrance
to his de-
termina-
tion.

Diuers cō-
sideratiōs
about the
vncertain-
ty of Pro-
testants
beliefe.

ued againe by Zuinglius and Oecolampadius; lett euery discret man, I say, consider what a difference this is, for a man to aduenture his soule and euerlasting inheritance thereon. For yf a man had demaunded of Ridley himselfe 4. or 5. yeares before this day, what a man *was bound to thinke and beleue* in this point for sauinge his soule, he would haue said the quite contrary to that he determineth now.

23. Secondly yow may consider another difference in this priuate determination, of Ridley & his associates from that of Catholike Councells; for that Councells after enquiry and disputations made for the truth, do determine by generall consent of the Bishoppes assembled, with assured assistance of the holy ghost; wheras *Maister Ridley* remytteth all to the priuate iudgement of *euery one at home, sentrally by himselfe*; which is as much to say, notwithstanding all the disputation; and his determination, yet must euery man and woman follow their owne fancy *at home*, and be iudge of all that hath byn disputed, or determined: & this is the certainty that Protestants haue for common people to rely vpon.

24. Thirdly yt is to be noted, that notwithstanding Fox calleth this decision, *the determination of Doctor Nicolas Ridley B. of Rochester*, vpon the conclusions aboue prefixed; yet handleth he only two questions in this his determination videlicet; *Transubstantiation*, and the *Sacrifice of the Altar*, but the first much more amply and abundantly, pretermittting the very cheefe & principall

principall question in deed, wherof all the rest dependeth, which is of the *reall presence*, which maketh the very essence of *Calvinian* and *Zuinglian* sect, wherby they do differ from both *Lutherans* and vs: of which absurd imposture we haue spoken sufficiently before, and seing so much had byn said in the former disputations about that point, though greatly against the Protestants inclination, me thinketh he ought not to haue left out wholly that question in this his determination. But as I haue often said, their principall shift in those dayes was to stepp from the mayne point, whether Christ were really in the Sacrament or no; & to leape vnto a quiddity of the manner of his being there, to witt by Transubstantiation. About which notwithstandinge, B. Ridley beginneth his resolution with great ostentation of words sayinge; that he had fise principall grounds or head springs for the same: First (to vse his words) *the authority, Maiestie, and verity of the scriptures*: secondly *the most certayne testimonyes of ancient Catholike Fathers*: thirdly *the definition of a Sacrament*: fourthly *the abhominable heresie of Eutiches, that way ensue of Transubstantiation*: fiftly, *the most sure beleefe of the article of our faith*; he ascended into heauen, &c.

Fise pretended
heades of
Ridleyes
determination.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

25. These be Maister Ridleyes fise bulwarks or castles of defence builded in the ayre, which he handleth so fondly and childishely, as after yow shall see in the particular examinations of his arguments. Only heere I will say in generall, that the reader shall find his *authority, Maiestie,*

maiestie, and *verity* of scriptures against Transubstantiation, to be a meere vaunt and vanity, for he hath no one cleere or substantiall place at all. And as for his cerryne testimonies of the ancient Fathers, they will proue so vncertaine for his purpose, as yow shall see them most certaynely against him. His third cattle of the definition of a Sacrament, vvill proue a cottage of no strength at all, for that the true nature of a Sacrament standeth well vvith Transubstantiation. His fourth head springe about the heresie of *Eutiches*, will proue a puddle, and himselfe puzzeled therin, for that the heresie of *Eutiches* confoundinge two distinct natures in Christ, hath no more coherence vvith Transubstantiation, then *Rocheſter* with *Rome*. And finally his last ground about the article of Christs ascendinge into heauen, hath no ground to rest on, but is a meere imagination in the ayre, to witt, that for so much as Christ ascended into heauen, *ergo* there is no Transubstantiation.

Ridleyes
resolution
about the
sacrifice of
the masse.

Fox pag.
1262.

26. Wherefore to leaue this first question of Transubstantiation, and passe to the second of sacrifice, yow must vnderstand, that when *Maister Ridley* had spent most of the time about Transubstantiation, he had little left concerning the sacrifice of the masse, but concluded his said determination in very few words thus: Now for the better conclusion (saith he) concerning the sacrifice, because yt dependeth vpon the first, I will in few vvords declare what I thinke. Two things do perswade me, that this conclusion (against the sacrifice of the masse)

masse)
certain
grau
aduen
as this
Priest
sacrific
Churc
conue
His m
of the
the Ep
bloud
one, &
two o
and o
stand
after y
turne
ny ot
will c
Caiho
himse
him o
profe
exter
Priest
27.
man
gene
dom
sed b
are c

masse) is true, that is certayne places of scripture, and
 certayne testimonyes of the Fathers. Lo heere the
 graue and weighty motives that Ridley had, to
 adventure vpon so great a change in beleefe
 as this was, after so many yeares, being a
 Priest and Catholike Bishopp, and offeringe
 sacrifice after the manner of the Catholike
 Church, from the first day of our contreyes
 conuersion, vnto th'end of K. Henryes raigne.
 His motives were, as yow heare, *certayne places*
of the scripture, which were only taken out of
 the Epistle to the Hebrues, talkinge of Christs
 bloody sacrifice on the crosse, which was but
 one, & certayne places of the Fathers, to witt,
 two or three misvnderstood out of *S. Augustine*,
 and one out of *Fulgentius*, all which notwith-
 standinge proue nothinge for his purpose, as
 after yow shall see declared in their place, and
 turne. And the selfe same Fathers haue so ma-
 ny other cleere places to the contrary, as we
 will desire no better iudges for prooffe of our
 Catholike cause, then yf Ridley would remitt
 himselfe to these two Fathers iudgements, by
 him cyted against vs; for that both of them do
 professe themselues to be Priests, and to offer
 externall sacrifice, vpon the Altar as our
 Priests do now.

27. Consider then how wise and constant a
 man Ridley was, to leaue his ancient faith so
 generally receaued throughout all Christen-
 dome in his dayes, and so many yeares practi-
 sed by himselfe, vpon two such motives, as
 are *certayne places of scripture misvnderstood* by him-
 selfe,

Hebr. 9. 10.

The mis-
erable pro-
ceeding of
Ridley.

selfe, and certayne testimonyes of *Fathers*, that seemed to him to haue some difficulty. Which leuity vvas so displeasaunt vnto almighty God, as by the effects we see, that wheras at the beginning he seemed to doubt vpon these two motiues, leauinge other men to iudge therof, he became by little and little to be so obstinately blinded at length therein, as albeir some foure or fīue yeares after, he were openly conuicted in disputations at *Oxford*, as by his answers yow shall afterwards see, yet was he content to burne for the same, which was the highest degree of calamity that could fall vpon him, in body and soule. And thus much of him and his determination for the present.

Sixt Disputation. §. 6.

The sixt
disputatiō
at Cam-
bridge by
Bucer 1549.

28. In all the former disputations both at *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, yow shall find nothings of friar *Martyn Bucer*, no not so much as that he is once named in all these conflicts, about the blessed Sacrament. And yet yow must remember, that he was principall reader of diuinity in *Cambridge* at this tyme, as *Peter Martyr* was in *Oxford*: and therefore as the first place was giuen to the said *Peter* in *Oxford*; so yt is likely, that the same would haue byn to *Martyn* in *Cambridge*, yf they had found him so pliable to their hands in his opinions about the Sacrament, as the other was; but in no case would he be induced as yet, to accommodate him-
selfe

selfe therein, and therefore had he not any part allowed him in this comedy, eyther of defendant, opponent, disputer, counselour, moderator, assistant, or other office or imployment: may yt is thought that he incurred so great disgrace about this matter, as he could willingly haue departed the realme againe, (as Bernardinus Ochinus vpon such like discontentment did from London) had not the necessity of his woman, and other impediments of pouerty letted him, not knowinge well whether to goe, as being expulsed from *Argentina* at his comming to England, as * before we haue shewed in the story of his life.

Martyn
Bucer in
great distresse.

* *Memor.*
Decemb.
cap. 16.

29. Wherefore resoluinge himselfe at length to passe ouer this mortification, and to giue our English Protestants some satisfaction, though not in the points which they desired, he thought it good after *Ridleyes* departure, to defend certayne other paradoxes, which Fox recordeth in these words: *Ouer and besides these disputations aboue mentioned, other disputations vvere holden in Cambridge shortly after by Martyn Bucer, vpon these conclusions followinge: First, that the canonick bookes of scripture alone, do sufficiently teach the regenerate all things necessary belonginge to saluation. Secondly, there is no Church on earth that erreth not, as well in faith, as in manners. Thirdly we are so iustified freely of God, that before our iustification, yt is sinne and prouoketh Gods wrath against vs, whatsoeuer good worke we seeme to do. Then being iustified, we do good works.*

Fox pag.
1262. &
1263.

1.

2.

3.

The questions of
Bucers disputation.

30. These were Bucers conclusions, which well

How scri-
ptures are
sufficient
to salua-
tion.

well I may call paradoxes, for that euen in the common sense & iudgement of euery meane capacity, the fallity and absurdity therof is apparant. For as touchinge the first, though we graunt, that the diuine books of scripture, yf they were fewer then they are (respectinge Gods holy prouidence) are sufficient to teach both regenerate and not regenerate (that beleeue the verity therof) the true way of saluation, and that the said diuine prouidence hath, doth, and will so prouide, that albeit some parts of these we now haue should be lost (as diuers others before haue byn) yet should the remnant still be sufficient to that purpose, with such other supplyes of Gods assistance as he would send; yet to say, as this man doth, *that the canonically bookes of scripture alone, do sufficiently reach all things belonging to saluation*; yf by alone he will exclude all other helpes of tradition, antiquity, testimony of the Church, interpretation of the Fathers, direction of generall Councils, and other like aydes, yt is a most absurd paradox; for neyther can we know which bookes are to be held canonically, nor what they teach truly & sincerely, nor what may be deduced out of them; yf we remoue the former helpes; And the case is, as yf one of the Kings of our countrey goinge abroad, as some did to Hierusalem, or other forrayne warres, and intending to be longe absent, should leaue with his Councillors for their better gouernement certayne lawes wrytten with his owne hand, & other dire-

Directions by word of mouth how to proceed, interpret, and use them, commaunding all men to obey them, and that some troublesome people after many yeares continuance in their gouernement, should appeale from them, to the Kings wrytten lawes only, prayinge the sufficiency therof (for better colouringe their pretence) and suinge that yt were blott vnto the said lawes, and to the Kings wisdom that made them, to acknowledge any insufficiency at all in them for perfect direction of the common welth, which lawes yet, themselues would expound, as pleased them best for their owne purposes.

In this case, who seeth not whervnto this practise tenderth, and for what causes so great prayes are giuen to the sufficiency of these lawes, vsed to make the praisers iudges of all, and to exempt them from all controlment of others? And the very same is seene in the other case of the scriptures, which being writen by the spiritt and finger of God himselve, and deliuered vnto vs by the Church, whose commission also and authority in the same scriptures is sett downe, byndinge vs vnder damnation to heare her from age to age, as the pillar and firmament of truth, there stepp vp together diuers sorts of sectaries in all ages, & of this of ours, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Caluinists, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and the like chalenged by the said Church of disobedience, and do all appeale ioyntly and seuerally from her, to onely scriptures, prayinge highly the sufficiency, and

A case representing the heretiks of our dayes about crying for scriptures alone.

Matt. 18.

1 Tim. 3.

Marc. 16.

Matt. 16.

and excellency therof, and refusinge all other meanes, eyther of tradition or ancient exposition, for vnderstandinge of the sense and true meaninge. And when we alleadge the Catholike Doctors and Pastors of euery age, as spirituall Gouvernours and Conselors vnder God in the Church, for explaninge his diuine will and meaninge in this behalfe; they refuse all, and only will be interpreters and expositors themselues, and this not only against the Catho. Church, which they ought to obey, but one sect also against another for their particular opinions, and diuersityes, which by this meanes are made irreconciliable, and indeterminate, as experience teacheth vs. For when, I pray yow, will Luther & Zuinglius or their followers, come to any accord eyther with vs, or amongst themselues by only canonick scriptures, expounded after each parties particular spirit, iudgement and affection? The like I may aske of Anabaptists & Arrians, English Protestants and Puritans, or of any other Sectaryes that yow can name vnto me, which neuer agreed by this way, nor euer will. And this is the first paradox of *Martyn Bucer*, that only scriptures are sufficient to teach euery man.

32. The second is yet worse (yf worse may be) to witt; *that there is no Church on earth, which erreth not as well in faith as manners.* Which yf yf be so, then erreth also in faith the true Church of Christ, and is a lyinge Church, and may lead vs into error and heresie. And of this yet followeth

The second
paradox of
Martyn
Bucer.

followeth againe, that we can haue no certainty of any thinge in this life, and that almighty God doth damne vs very vniustly for heresie, wherinto we may be brought by his true Church, and spouse, which on the other side, he hath commaunded vs to heare, and obey vnder payne of damnation; yt followeth also, that S. Paul did falsely call the Church, the pillar and firmament of truth; for as much as yt may both deceaue and be deceaued. Christs promise also was false, when he assured his Church, that he would be with her by his spirit of truth vnto the worlds end; and that, the gates of hell should not preuaile against her. All these absurdities, impossibilities and impieties, do follow of this second paradox, besides infinite others, which any meane capacity may deduce of himselfe.

3. The third paradox also is no lesse monstrous to common sense and reason, then the two former, to witt, that vvhatsouer good worke any man doth, or may seeme to doe before iustification, is sinne, and prouoketh Gods wrath. But I would aske this new opiniatour or paradox-defender, how he would answere to that of Exodus, where yt is said of the Egyptian mid-wyues (infidells no doubt) *quia timuerunt obstetrices Deum, edificauit illis domos*. God gaue them a boundant children, for that vpon feare of offendinge almighty God, they disobayed their King Pharao in sauinge the Hebrues children. Both God vse to reward sinne? or to prayse that which prouoketh his wrath? Again, the prophet Ezechiell sheweth vs how God did

Math. 18.

1. Tim. 3.

Marc. 13.

Math. 16.

The third paradox of Martyn Bucer.

Exod. 1.

Ezech. 20. temporally reward Nabuchodonozor and his army with the spoyle of Egypt, for that they had serued him faithfully in chastizinge of Tyru. And *S. Hierome* vpon that place hath these words: By that Nabuchodonosor receaued this reward for his good worke, we learne that gentills also yf they do any good thinge, shall not leese their reward at Gods hands; and how can God be said to reward that which offendeth him? The Prophet *Daniell* also to the same Nabuchodonosor an infidell, gaue this counsell, *peccata tua elemosinis redime*: redeeme thy synnes with almes, which he would neuer haue done, yf yt had byn a synne, & prouoked Gods wrath to giue almes, or to performe any such other morall vertue before iustification, especially being styrrred & holpen thervnto by Gods especial help, which may be before iustification, as *Martyn Bucer* in this paradox supposeth. And lastly not to stand any longer in this which is of it selfe so euident; I would aske friar *Martyn* whether *Cornelius* the centurion being yet a gentile, did sinne and prouoke Gods wrath in prayinge, and giuinge almes before his conuersion? Yf he say yea (as needs he must accordinge to his doctrine) the text of scripture is against him, for the Angell said vnto him *Thy prayers and almes-deeds, haue ascended vp, and haue byn called into remembrance in the sight of God.* Vpon which words *S. Augustine* in diuers of his works, doth call the said almes-deeds of *Cornelius*, before he beleued in Christ, *Iustice*, and the gifts of God, which he would neuer haue done,

*Hier. in
Comment.
in cap. 20.
Ezech.*

Dan. 4.

*hinds of T
tozobasq
ap. 11.
m. 11.*

Aug. 10.

*Aug. 1. de
prædestinat.
sancti cap. 7.
& lib. 1. de
Baptis. c. 3.
et l. 4. c. 3.*

done,

done, yf they had byn synnes, and prouoked Gods
wrath, as this new-fangled friar hath taken
vpon him to defend.

4. And this shalbe sufficient for this sixt di-
putation of *Martyn Bucer*, which is five tymes
as much, as *Fox* setteth downe of the same, for
that he relateth only the time and place of the
said dispute, togeather with the conclusions
fore mentioned, & that *Sedgewicke*, *Tonge*, and
Perne were opponents to *Bucer* therein; but all
the rest he remitteth to a larger discourse at
another tyme, supplyinge the breuity of this
Bucerian disputation, with another dispute
betweene custome and verity, which he cal-
leth: *A fruitfull dialogue*, gathered out (saith *Fox*)
of the *Tractations* of *Peter Martyn*, and other authors,
by a certayne reuerend person of this realme, teachinge
men not to measure Religion by custome, but to try
custome by truth, &c.

Fox pag.
1263.

And this was another diuise of those
dayes of Innouations and noueltyes, to dazell
simple mens eyes, as though *Custome* and *Veri-*
ty, the handmayd and maistresse, were so fal-
len out, that one impugned the other, & could
not agree or stand togeather any longer, and
consequently *custome* and *antiquity*, must needs
gve place to *novelty*; the fraud and folly of
which diuise may in very few words be dis-
couered, and their true frendshipp and agree-
ment easily be declared; yea their inseparable
coherence to be such, as in our case of the con-
uersion about the *reall presence* (for in this
point they are made to braule and full out)

An alter-
cation be-
twene
custome
& verity.

The 7. di-
sputation
in the co-
nocation
house anno
1553.

Fox pag.
1234.

M. Doctor
Vveston
prolocu-
tor.

Fox *ibid.*

tisfaction only to Protestants of those dayes, when Catholike Religion was to be restored to th' end that the other might see their owne leuity in changinge the same. And the first of these disputations (being the seauenth in order) was held in the conuocation house, at *S. Pauls Church in London*, begon (as Fox saith) vpon the 18. of October in the foresaid yeare, and during for six dayes togeather. The questions vvere the accustomed about the reall presence and Transubstantiation. The manner of disputinge was not in forme or after any fashion of schoole, but rather of proposinge doubts, and answeringe the same for satisfaction of them that were not resolved, and so much lesse then in the former was any thinge pursued to any point of triall. Doctor *Vveston* deane of *VWestminster* was chosen prolocutor, who protested in his preface (as Fox saith) *that this conference vvas not held to call any points of Catholike Religion into doubt, but to solue such scruples or doubts, as any man might pretend to haue.*

38. This conuocation consisted for the greatest part, of all those clergy-men that had borne rule in *K. Edwards* dayes, exceptinge *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer* and *Rogers*, and I know not yf any other that were commytted before. And the first point that was handled therin, was about a certayne Calvinian Catechisme, sett forth a little before vnder the name of that conuocation, whervnto the prolocutor required subscriptions, to testifie that yt was not sett forth by their consents, meaninge,

ninge, as yt seemed, therby to conuince Ridley
or Crammer, or both of false dealinge therin.
The second point was of subscribing to the
reall presence, wherynto all the whole house
agreed (saith Fox) sauinge fise or six, to witt,
Maister Philips Deane of Rochester, Maister Haddon
Deane of Exceter, Maister Philpott Archdeacon
of VVinchester, Maister Cheyney Archdeacon of
Hereford, & Maister Elmour Archdeacon of Stow,
and one other whome he nameth not, and by
these were propounded all the doubts; that
were there discussed: and as for the first two
dayes, there was nothinge done at all, but a
certaine communication. The third day came
the Lord great-master, with the Earle of De-
uonshire and diuers other noble men, and
Cheyney afterward Bishopp of Gloucester, who
confessed the reall presence, but not Transubstan-
tiation, proposed some doubts about the se-
cond point, which we shall afterwards exa-
mine in their place. The prolocutor appoin-
ted Doctor Moreman to aunswere him and the
rest extempore, wherby we may ghesse how
substantiall a disputation yt was, for that the
Defendant came nothinge at all prepared. Phi-
lips also proposed somewhat about the reall
presence; Elmour and Haddon spake little vpon
that day, though the next day Elmour, then
Chaplain to the Duke of Suffolke, and after
Bishopp of London, read certayne authorities
out of a note-booke, which he had gathered
against the reall presence.

Six only of
all the co-
nocation
house re-
fused to
subscribe.

M. Cheyney.

D. More-
man.

M. Elmour.

M. Philips.

9. But of all other, the most busy was Phil-

they cannot possibly be separated. For yf verity in this matter haue not antiquity and custome with yt, yt is nouelty, and by consequence not verity at all. And on the other side, custome in points of Christian faith and beleefe, yf yt be generall, and of long tyme (for otherwise yt cannot properly be called custome, in the subiect we handle) may not possibly be found in our Christian Church without verity, for that otherwise the whole Church should vniuersally admitt a falsity, & continue yt by custome, which to imagine were folly and madnesse, yea most insolent madnes, yf vve beleeeue *S. Augustine*, whose

*Aur. epist.
118. ad Iu-
lianum.*

words are: *Disputare contra id, quod tota per orbem frequentat Ecclesia, insolentissima insania est.* It is most insolent madnes to dispute against that which the whole Church throughout the world doth practice. And he addeth in the same place, though it be not cōtained in the scriptures

36. Wherefore for *Iohn Fox*, and his reuerent maister *Nicolas Ridley*, *Peter Martyr* and others to come out now with a dialogue or brauling altercation, betweene custome and verity about the matter of the Sacrament, and to seeke to sett them by the eares, or make a diuorſe betweene them, for that custome had continued from the beginning of our conuersion to this day without verity, was a very simple and ridiculous diuise, & worthy *Iohn Fox* his wit and grauity, for by this he confesseth in effect that custome and antiquity was against him wherof we in this matter do rightly also in

Custome
and verity
cannot be
at odds in
the Chri-
stian
Church.

ferre,
Chriſt
Chur
ages,
ro aſſi
Fox o
again
ſtome
gentil
welth
all wh
begin
as our
of thi
verity
gume
barr b
ſhal be
So as
ſhall n

37.
reco
ſtants
new r
the co
enſue
yeares
vvhich
gouer
ſerr

ferre, verity I say in this matter concerninge Christian faith and beleefe, receaued in the Church by custome and tradition of former ages, which our sauour Christ did promise to assit with his spiritt of truth, whatsoeuer Fox or his fellowes may obiekt, or we admitt, against Idolarry or other reprehensible customes of former tymes amongst the Iewes, gentills, nations, contreyes, and commonwelthes different from the Christian Church; all which had no such assurance of truth, for beginninge and continuinge their customes, as our Christian Church hath. And so much of this feigned fight, betweene custome and verity in Christian Religion; whatsoeuer arguments of moment are alleaged in the combatt betweene them about the *reall presence*, shalbe afterward handled in their due places. So as of this disputation and *Martyn Bucers* We shall make but one, to witt, the sixt.

Seauenth Disputation. §. 7.

37. Hitherto are the publike disputations, recorded by Fox to haue byn held by Protestants, for establishinge and authorizinge their new religion vnder K. Edward, and all within the compasse of one yeare, to witt, 1549. there ensue now foure other, appointed some foure yeares after in the first of Q. *Maryes* raigne 1553. vvhich albeit they were vnder a Catholike gouernement, yet were they for giuinge sa-

The 7. di-
sputation
in the co-
nocation
house anno
1553.

Fox pag.
1234.

M. Doctor
VWeston
prolocu-
tor.

Fox *ibid.*

tisfaction only to Protestants of those dayes, when Catholike Religion was to be restored to th' end that the other might see their owne leuity in changinge the same. And the first of these disputations (being the seauenth in order) was held in the conuocation house, at *S. Pauls Church in London*, begon (as Fox saith) vpon the 18. of October in the foresaid yeare, and during for six dayes togeather. The questions vvere the accustomed about the reall presence and Transubstantiation. The manner of disputinge was not in forme or after any fashio[n] of schoole, but rather of proposinge doubts, and answeringe the same for satisfaction of them that were not resolved, and so much lesse then in the former was any thinge pursued to any point of triall. Doctor *VWeston* deane of *VWestminster* was chosen prolocutor, who protested in his preface (as Fox saith) *that this conference vvas not held to call any points of Catholike Religion into doubt, but to solue such scruples or doubts, as any man might pretend to haue.*

38. This conuocation consisted for the greatest part, of all those clergy-men that had borne rule in *K. Edwards* dayes, exceptinge *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer* and *Rogers*, and I know not yf any other that were commytted before. And the first point that was handled therin, was about a certayne Calvinian Catechisme, sett forth a little before vnder the name of that conuocation, whervnto the prolocutor required subscriptions, to testifie that yt was not sett forth by their consents, mea-
ninge,

ninge, as yt seemed, therby to conuince Ridley
or Crammer, or both of false dealinge therin.
The second point was of subscribing to the
reall presence, wherynto all the whole house
agreed (saith Fox) sauinge foue or six, to witt,
Maister Philips Deane of Rochester, Maister Haddon
Deane of Exceter, Maister Philpott Archdeacon
of Winchester, Maister Cheyney Archdeacon of
Hereford, & Maister Elmour Archdeacon of Stow,
and one other whome he nameth not, and by
these were propounded all the doubts, that
were there discuffed: and as for the first two
dayes, there was nothinge done at all, but a
certaine communication. The third day came
the Lord great-master, with the Earle of De-
vonshire and diuers other noble men, and
Cheyney afterward Bishopp of Gloucester, who
confessed the reall presence, but not Transubstan-
tiation, proposed some doubts about the se-
cond point, which we shall afterwards exa-
mine in their place. The prolocutor appoin-
ted Doctor Moreman to aunswere him and the
rest extempore, wherby we may ghesse how
substantiall a disputation yt was, for that the
Defendant came nothinge at all prepared. Phi-
lips also proposed somewhat about the reall
presence; Elmour and Haddon spake little vpon
that day, though the next day Elmour, then
Chaplain to the Duke of Suffolke, and after
Bishopp of London, read certayne authorities
out of a note-booke, which he had gathered
against the reall presence.

Six only of
all the co-
nocation
house re-
fused to
subscribe.

M. Cheyney.

D. More-
man.

M. Elmour.

M. Philips.

9. But of all other, the most busy was Phil-

Fox pag.
1285.

John Phil-
potts vaunt
in the co-
vocation
house.

pott, both that day, and the other followinge,
vauntinge and chalenginge the whole com-
pany to dispute. Then quoth Philpotts (saith Fox)
I will speake playne English, the Sacrament of the Al-
tar, which yee reckon to be all one with the masse; was
Sacrament at all, neyther is Christ any wise present in
yt, and this his sayinge he offered to proue before the
rvhole house, yf they listed to call him thervnto, and be-
fore the Queens grace, and her counsell, and before the
face of six of the best learned men of the house of the
contrary opinion, and refused none. And yf I shall not
be able (quoth he) to maintayne by Gods word that I
haue said, and confound those six which shall take vpon
them to withstand me, in this point, let me be bur-
ned with as many faggotts as be in London, before the
court-gates, &c. This was Philpotts vaunt, and
yet yf yee consider the poore arguments he
brought forth in this conference, which after-
wards shalbe discussed, togeather with his
fond answers that he gaue in his 15. or 16. se-
uerall examinations, before the Bishoppes of
Winchester, London, Chichester, Bangor and others
(for so much payne was taken to saue him)
yow will say that his B. Gardiner had reason,
when he held him for more then halfe madd,
as in his story we haue related. Consider also,
that his denying Christ to be present any wise
in the Sacrament, is much different from that
yow heard Maister Perne affirme before, by ap-
probation of Maister Ridley the moderator, that
Christs body was truly, wholly, and verily in
the Sacrament after a certayne propriety; but
these men must not be taken at their words.

40. And

40. And finally, the conclusion of all this conference with Philpott was, that the prolocutor in the end, seing him out of all reason to trouble the house, layed two comaundements vpon him; the first that he should not come thither any more, vnlesse he came in gowne and typpett, as the others came: the second, that he should not speake but in order, and with licence as the rest did; whose aunswere Fox relateth in these words: *then quoth Philpott* Fox *ibid.*
I had rather be absent altogether, so insufferable was all order, or temperate manner of proceedinge to this disorderly man; and so Q. Mary sent a wryte the next day to dissolue the conuocation: And such as had disputed (saith Fox) on the contrary part, were driuen, some to fly, some to deny, and some to dye, though to most mens iudgements, that heard the disputation, they had the vpper hand, &c. These are hereticall bragges, as yow will better see afterwards when we come to examining of arguments. And as for dyinge, none of the forsaide disputers died, to our knowledge, but only Philpott in his madd moode; Cheyney, Elmour, and Haddon gott Bishopricks, & other dignities vnder Q. Elizabeth. And so much of this disputation in the conuocation house.

*Eight, ninth, and tenth
 Disputation. §. 8.*

41. These last three disputations I do ioyn together, for that they were held successiuely
 in

Three di-
sputations
in Oxford
against
Cranmer,
Ridley and
Latimer.

Fox pag.
1199.

Fox *ibid.*

The indis-
cret dealinge of
Cath. in
their di-
sputation

in Oxford vpon three seuerall dayes in the mo-
neth of Aprill, anno 1554. with *Cranmer*, *Ridley*,
and *Latimer* vpon the forsaide three questions
of the reall presence, Transubstantiation, and the sa-
crifice of the masse. The names (saith Fox) of the
vniuersity Doctors and graduates, appointed
to dispute against them vpon the said que-
stions, were these of Oxford, Doctor *VVeston* pro-
locutor, Doctor *Tressam*, Doctor *Cole*, Doctor *Ogle-*
thorpe, Doctor *Pye*, Maister *Harpesfield*, Maister *Feck-*
nam. Of Cambridge, Doctor *Tonge* Vice Chaun-
celour, Doctor *Glynn*, Doctor *Seton*, Doctor *VVatson*,
Doctor *Sedgewicke*, and Doctor *Atkinson*, to witt six of
each vniuersity, all meeting at Oxford together to this
effect. Thus farre Fox; who describeth also
the manner and forme of this disputation,
much more reasonable, orderly & indifferent,
then all the former disputations vnder the
Protestants, yf we beleue Fox himselfe, who
saith; that in the middle of the Doctors, there
were appointed foure to be *exceptores argumen-*
torum, wryters of the arguments (to vse his
words) and a table sett in the middest, and foure no-
taries sittinge with them; So as by his relation
there were eight indifferent men chosen to
register whatsoeuer passed: yet yf he relate
truly, the manner of arguinge, was not so or-
derly and schoolelike as might haue byn,
wherby yt came to passe, that scarce any ar-
gument was prosecuted to the end; and the
answeringe was such, as comonly was wholly
from the purpose, as by diuers examples, yow
shall see afterwards declared; as also we shall
examine

examine what arguments *Cranmer* could allege against the *reall presence*, vpon the fourth day of disputation, to witt the next day after *Laymer* had ended. For that *Doctor Harpesfield* answeringe for his degree, defended the question of the *reall presence*, and *Maister Cranmer* was courteously inuited to the said disputation, and suffered to say what he would or could against that verity, & was fully answered; notwithstandinge *Fox* will needs beare vs in hand to the contrary, as his fashion is.

2. And wheras the said *Doctor Harpesfield* in his preface, did much commend the diligent readinge of scripture with prayer, and conferring one place with another, but yet said that this was no secure way or meane, for euery particular man to resolue himselfe of the sense therof, but must rather beleue the body of the Catholike Church therein, then his owne iudgement. *Fox* saith that *Maister Cranmer* in his reply reprehended that direction, sayinge: *wheras you referre the true sense & iudgement of the scriptures to the Catholike Church, as iudge therof, you are much deceaued, &c.* And *Fox* himselfe addeth this marginall note: *If Maister Harpesfield (when he saith we must not follow our owne heads and senses, but giue ouer our iudgement to the holy Catholike Church) had willed vs to submit our selues to the holy Ghost he had said much better.* So *Iohn*. But I would aske him, who shalbe iudge what the holy Ghost teacheth vs? For that is the question. For yf a particular man readinge the scripture with prayer, and conferringe place with

The foolish
lish repre-
hensio v-
sed by
Cranmer &
Fox.

Fox pag.
1326.

with place only, may be presumed to attayne therby the true meaninge of the holy Ghost (which notwithstanding cannot be certayne, for that an heretike may vse the same meanes) how much more may the vniuersall body of the Church, vsing the selfe-same meanes also, as many of her learned members no doubt do; how much more, I say, may shee be thought and presumed to attayne to the true sense of the holy Ghost, seing that she hath a speciall promise of his infallible assistance to that effect, which particular men haue not, though heretiks are wont proudly to presume therof. And so yow shall see yt appeare also in these disputations, when we come to discusse the particulars.

43. And heere it is to be noted, that presently vpon the end of this *Oxford disputation*, vnder *Q. Mary*, it was reported, that others should be held at *Cambridge* betweene the Doctors of that vniuersity, and the residue of the Protestant preachers that were in prison; wherof they being aduertised by the warninge of *Doctor Ridley*, as yt seemeth by *Fox*, and castinge their heads rogeather vpon the matter, determined to refuse all disputation, except it were before the Queene and priuy Councell, or before the houses of parliament, to which effect they sett forth a publike wrytinge and protestation, with certayne reasons of excuses mouinge them therunto, subscribed by *Hooper*, *Farrer*, *Taylor*, *Philpott*, *Bradford*, *Rogers*, *Saunders*, and some others. And their cheefe excuse was,

For pag.
2336.

The Protestant Ministers excuse themselves from disputation.

for the
lamen
siderin
cour
deter
stants

of

44.
to set
the fir
withi
hath
thoug
these
ywher
presen
again
Lamb
prece
Q. Eli
perio
of the
beyon
were
Bitho
Docto
liele, L
Doct

for that matters had byn determined by parliament before they were disputed of, nor consideringe that in K. Edwards dayes, the same course with farre lesse reason was held and determined by Parliament, before the Protestants disputations in Cambridge.

Of diuers other Disputations held besides these ten. §. 9.

44. These ten disputations I thought good to sett downe, for that they were held vpon the first chaunges of Religion in England, within the space of 4. or 5. yeares, as before hath byn said: diuers others I do passe ouer, though some of them were as sollemne as these; as that of K. Henry the 8. against *Lambert*, vherin *Doctor Cranmer* disputed for the reall presence, and the *Lord Cromwell* gaue sentence against him, as we haue shewed* before in *Lamberts* story. That also which was held on pretended in the beginninge of the raigne of *Q. Elizabeth* at Westminster, betweene nyne persons of the Catholike parte, and as many of the Protestant preachers newly come from beyond the seas. Those of the Catholike side were five Bishoppes, to witt *Doctor Iohn VVhit* Bishopp of *VVinchester*, *Doctor Baynes* of *Lichfield*, *Doctor Scott* of *Chester*, *Doctor Oglethorpe* of *Carlisle*, *Doctor VVatson* of *Lincolne*, with foure other Doctors adioyned vnto them, *Doctor Cole*

Deane

The disputation
of K. Henry
vith
Lambert.

* Sup. cap.
14. du 4.
Oftob.

A pretended disputation in the beginning of *Q. Elizabeths* raigne anno 1559.

Deane of London, Doctor Langedale Archdeacon of *Lewis*, Doctor Harpesfield Archdeacon of *Canterbury*, and Doctor Chadsey Archdeacon of *Middlesex*. And for the Protestant parte, were Doctor Scory an Apostata friar, & Doctor Cox before mentioned, that fledd the realme vnder *Q. Mary*, with whome ioyned *M. VVhitehead*, *M. Grindall*, *M. Horne*, *M. Sandes*, *M. Ghest*, *M. Elmour*, and *M. Iewell*, all freshly come from beyond the seas, who all, except some one or two, were soone after for their good demeritts, made Bishopps, and accommodated by thrustinge out the other, in reward of this disputation, wherein notwithstanding there was not one argument made, nor solution giuen, but only an ostentation sought to effectuate that with some colour, which otherwise was determined before, and lacked but a pretence, for that the Queene and those that were nearest about her, hauinge determined to make a change of Religion, thought they should do yt best, and most iustificable, yf they promised some name of disputation, wherein the Catholiks had byn satisfied or vanquished; to which end, there were so many shifts, partialities, and diuises vsed, and so many iniuries offered to the Bishopps of the Catholike party, as they thought good vpon the second dayes meetinge, to passe on no further, except more reason or indifferency vvere vsed towards them.

45. For first, in this disputation summoned & denounced throughout the whole realme,

by

by order of the Queene and Councell, Syr Nicolas Bacon lately made Lord Keeper, tooke vpon him to be president, and cheefe moderator, whome all men knew to be one of the greatest aduersaryes to Catholike Religion, that was in England, violent in condition, and vtterly ignorant in matters of diuinity. Secondly the questions appointed to be disputed on, were not chosen nor assigned by the said Bishoppes, but by the same Syr Nicolas and his adherents in the name of the Councell, at the instance or pleasure of the Protestant new pretenders, wherof when the Bishoppes complained, the Lord Keeper answered: *the questions are neyther of their (to witt the Protestants) propoundinge, nor of your diuise, but offered indifferently to you both.*

46. The questions were three, first *whether it were against Gods word, and the custome of the primitive Church, to vse a tongue vnkowne to the people in common prayer, and administration of Sacraments.* The second, *whether euery Church had authority to appoint, take away, and change ceremonyes and Ecclesiasticall rites, so the same be to edification.* Thirdly *whether yt can be proued by the word of God, that there is offered vp in the masse a sacrifice propitiatory for the quicke, and the dead: VVhich questions vvere to be handled (saith Fox) in the presence of the Queenes Councell, Nobility, and other of the parlament house, for the better satisfaction and enablinge of their iudgements, to treat and conclude of such lawes as might depend heerevpon. By which words you may easily conceaue what the drift of this pretended di-*

sputa-

The great inequality & iniuries offered in this pretended disputation.

Fox pag. 1924.

Three questions to small purpose

Fox pag. 1919.

sputation was, and how guilefully these questions were chosen, and sett downe, yf yow marke their words and sentie, especially the former two, which only or principally were to be handled, and how impertinent these questions were to the great moment of the whole matter and sequele, that was to ensue therof, which was no lesse then the vniuersall change of the whole body of Catholike Religion, throughout the realme.

Diuers
frauds.

47. This then was the first hereticall fraud in appointinge this disputation, and the questions to be disputed, but they were many more and greater in the prosecution therof; for first the Catholike cleargy lackinge their cheife head, which was the Archbishopp of Canterbury lately dead, the other Archbishopp of Yorke, to witt, *Doct^r Heath* was entertayned with feyre words for a time, to effectuate with his brethren, what the Protestant party of the Conncell should thinke expedient wherypon he being Chancelour yet in name, though the effect of his office was giuen to *Syr Nicolas Bacon*, vnder the litle of *Lord Keeper*, he was brought into the place of disputation, and sate in his roome amongst other Councellours, together with the Duke of Norfolk, & other of the nobility as one of them, and rather against the Bishops, then for them (though no doubt the good man meant yt not so) then was yt appointed to the said Catholike Bishoppes by the Archbishopp, in name of the Councell, only two dayes before their

meeting

meetinge at the conference (for so complay-
neth the Bishop of *Lincolne* in the second dayes
meetinge) that both they, to witt the Bishops,
should begin to say what they could for
themselues, & the Protestant preachers should
answere them. And secondly that the confe-
rence should be in English and not in Latyn;
and thirdly, that yt should not be by way of
arguinge or disputinge, but only of speech or
readinge yt out of some booke or paper: All
which three points seeminge indignities to
the Bishoppes, they complayned greuously
therof at their first publike meetinge, which
was in *Westminster* Church vpon the last of
March 1559. beinge friday; and *Bishop VWhite* of
VWinchester beinge the first to speake for his side,
said that they were ready to dispute & argue,
but had not their wrytinge ready to be read
there, but would do it at their next meetinge:
yet for giuinge some satisfaction, *Doctor Cole*
extempore alleaged some breife reasons concer-
ninge the former questions or propositions,
reseruinge the rest vnto their fuller booke or
wrytinge.

Three in-
dignities
offered
vnto the
Bishops.

D. Cole

An offen-
tation of
the Prote-
stant side.

3.

48. But heerevpon presently the Protestant
preachers came out with their booke, or inue-
stique against Latyn seruice, fraught with a
rayne shew of many allegations, Scripttures,
Fathers, Councells, and Constitutions of Em-
perors, sounding as it might seeme somewhat
to their party, though nothing at all in truth,
if yow examine them, as they ly in Fox him-
self; but with this ostentation they sought to

F gett

get the applause of the people, & heerby well declared that they had more then two dayes warninge to prepare themselues; and albeit when this was done, the Bishops offered to refute all the same cleerely at the next meetinge, yet could they not be heard or permitted, as presently we shall shew, but that this must needs stand for the whole resolution in the first questiō. And Fox like one of his kind, seeketh to preuent the matter in these words:

Fox pag.
1922.

The same being reade (to witt the wryting of the Protestant party) vvith some likelyhood as it seemed that the same was much allowable to the audience, certayne of the Bishoppes began to say, contrary to their former aunswere, that they had now much more to say in this matter, vvherin although they might vvell haue byn reprehended; yet for auoydinge of any more mistake, and that they should viter all they had to say, yt was ordered that vpon munday followinge, the Bishoppes should bringe their mynd and reasons in vvryting to the second assertion, and to the last also ys they could, and first read the same, and that done the other part should bring likewise theirs, &c.

open
inequali-
ty.

49. Lo heere the indifferency that was vsed; the Bishoppes are accused of cauillation, that they offered to aunswere in wrytinge to the Protestants libell, which is not only denyed them, but yt is ordayned also, that after other two dayes, they should bringe in whatsoever they haue to say to the second and third questions, and readinge yt first, giue their aduersaries leaue to triumphe in the second place, as they had done vpon the first question the day before.

before. But vpon munday, when all the assembly was sett, the Bishoppes stood firmly vpon this, that they would first read publicly their owne vvytynge, vvhich there they brought with them vpon the first question of *Latyn seruice*, in answer to that of the Protestants at the last meeting, but in no case would yt be graunted them. Fox relateth the Altercation thus.

50. VVinchester. I am determyned for my part, that there shalbe now read that, vvhich vve haue to say for the first question.

L. Keeper. VVill you not then proceed in the order appointed you?

Winchester. VVe should suffer preiudice, ys you permitt vs not to treat of the first question first, and so vve vould come to the second, and I iudge all my brethren are so mynded.

Bishoppes. VVe are all so determyned.

L. Keeper. You ought to looke vvhath order is appointed you to keepe, &c.

Winchester. Syth our aduersaryes part haue so confirmed their assertion, we suffer preiudice ys you permitt vs not the like.

Lincolne. VVe are not vsed indifferently, sithen you allow vs not, to open in present vvytynge that, vve haue to say for declaration of the first question, &c. for that vvhich Maister Cole spake in this late assembly, as not prepared to strengthen our cause, but he made oration of himselfe extempore, &c. VVe are allowed as touching the tyme, our aduersaryes not hauinge warninge longe before, and we were warned only two dayes before the last assembly in this place,

Altercatiō
of the Bif-
hops with
Syr Nic-
las Bacon.

The reso-
lute spe-
ach of D.
VVilson B.
of Lincolne.

and vvith this busines and other trouble, we haue byn dryuen to be occupied the whole last night, for we may in no case betray the cause of God nor will not do, but susteyne it to the vttermost of our power, but heervnto vve vvant presently indifferent vsinge, &c.

L. Keeper. I am vvillinge and ready to heare yow, after the order taken for yow to reason therin, and further or contrary to that, I cannot deale vvith yow.

Lichfield. Let vs suffer no disorder heerm, but be heard vvith indifferency.

51. Thus went on that contention, wherof I omitt much for breuityes sake; but by this little, so partially declared by Fox, as may be immagined, and appeareth also by diuers circumstances, yow may ghesse how the matter passed, and which part had more reason. At the length, the Archbishop of Yorke, knowing belike that this standinge of the Bishoppes would not preuaile against designements, already made by the Queene and Councell in disgrace of the Catholike cause, willed the Bishoppes to giue ouer in this matter, and to passe to the second question. But then began a new strife, which party should first begin to speake in this question also, the Bishops affirminge both in respect they had begonne the other day, and that the Protestant party was plaintife or accusant, they should begin, and the Bishoppes would answere, but this in no case would be graunted, but that the Bishops must begin againe, and the other haue the last word as before: which indignity the Bishop of Lichfield being not well able to beare, requere

sted

sted
mig
Carl
that
the f
some
thes
52.
are m
these
H
L.
wand
Li
vvith
in and
bringe
W
onwar
Ch
appl
that th
Lic
vvhere
Elm
yow be
L. I
rayne,
depart.
Wi
vvill not
some
the aff

sted humbly the Lords there present, that they might dispute, and try first which party was Catholike and of the Catholike Church, for that therby would appeare who had right to the first or second place of speach, and being somewhat earnest therin, spake to M. Horne in these words as Fox relateth.

52. Lichfield. Maister Horne, Maister Horne, there are many Churches in Germany, I pray you which of these Churches are ye of?

Another
altercatiō
with the
L. Keeper.

Horne. I am of Christs Catholike Church.

L. Keeper. You ought not thus to runne into wandringe talke of your owne inuentings, &c.

Lichfield. Nay we must first go thus to worke with them yf we will search a truth: these men come in and pretend to be doubtfull, therefore they should first bringe what they haue to impugne, &c.

Winchester. Lett them begin, so will we go onward.

Chester. They speakinge last would depart cum applausu populi, &c. surely we thinke yt meete that they should for their parts giue vs place.

Lichfield. Yea that they should and ought to do, where any indifferency is vsed.

Elmour. VVe giue you place, do we not? I pray you begin.

L. Keeper. Yf you make this assembly gathered in vayne, and will not go to the matter, lett vs rise vp and depart.

Winchester. Contented, lett vs be gone: for we will not in this point giue ouer. And so finally after some other like altercation, Bacon dissolued the assembly with this threat.

L. Keeper. My Lords, for that yow vwill not, that yve shall heare yow, you may chaunce shortly to heare of vs. So he. And this hearinge was; that soone after (saith Stow) the Bishoppes of Lincolne and Winchester vvere sent to the Towar, and the rest bound to make dayly, and personall appearance before the Councell, and not to depart the Citty of London and VVestminster, vntill further order vvere taken vvith them for their disobedience and contempt.

Stow anno
Domini
1559.

The issue
of this di-
sputation
vvith the
Bishops.

53. And this was the issue of the first disputation vnder Q. Elizabeth, vvherof presently there was a booke printed and published, accordinge to the fashion of the new Doctors, giuinge the victory to the Protestants, and ouerthrow to the Cath. Bishoppes, who yet, as yow see, were neuer permitted to propose any one argument, or reason in due place and tyme.

54. And with this shall we end our narration of publike disputations, omitting many more priuate and particular, as the conference of Ridley, and Secretary Burne, Doctor Fecknam, and others in the towar, in the beginninge of Q. Maryes raigne: The colloquy of the foresaid Fecknam, with the Lady Iane in the same place; the particular conferences and examinations of Hooper, Farrar, Taylour, Rogers, Philpott, Smyth, Bradford, Tyms, Saunders, Blandford, and others of the learned sort of Protestants, but many more of craftesmen, artificers, weomen, and such like of the ignorant sort, in the Bishoppes consistories and other places: Out of which also we shall reduce the summe of the princi-

Fox pag.
6297.

pall

all arguments or answers, yf yt be different from the rest; when we come afterward to their due places.

55. And now all this being seene and considered, the reader will easily discern, what ground of certainty may be drawne from all these disputations, altercations, and conferences, to found thereon the security of his soule in belecuing, as the Protestants doe: yea and yeldinge themselves to the fire for yt, as many did in *Q. Maryes* dayes, vpon the same and credit of the forsaid disputations, which yet many of them vnderstood not, nor euer heard or read, but most of all were not able to resolue themselves by them, yf they had heard, read, or vnderstood them, but only in generall they rested themselves vpon this point, that the Protestants were learned men, and had gotten the victory in disputations against the Catholiks, for that so yt was told them. And this they thought sufficient for their assurance.

The inference vpon these disputations.

56. But now on the contrary side, yf a man would oppose to these ten publike disputations before recyted, ten learned Councells of the Catholike Church, that disputed, examined, and condemned this heresie of theirs against the *reall presence*, vwithin the space of these last 600. yeares, since *Berengarius* first began yt, as namely those foure named by *Lincke*, to witt, that of *Rome* vnder *Leo* the 9. and another of *Versells* vnder the same Pope; the third at *Towars* in France vnder *Pope Victor*

Ten councells examined & confirmed the doctrine of the *reall presence*.

*Laufraus.
contra Be-
rengarium.*

**VVald.
tom. 1. de
Sacram.
cap. 43.*

successor to *Leo*, the fourth at *Rome* againe vnder Pope *Nicolas* the second; In all which *Berengarius* himselfe was present, and in the last, not only abiured, but burnt his owne booke. And after this, six other Councells to the same effect, the first at *Rome* vnder *Gregory* the 7. where *Berengarius* againe abiured, as * *VValdensis* testifieth: The second of *Lateran* in *Rome* also vnder *Innocentius* the third: the generall Councell of *Vienna*; the fourth at *Rome* againe vnder Pope *Iohn* the 22. the fifth at *Constance*, and the sixth at *Trent*. All these Councells (I say) yt a man consider with indifferency of what variety of learned men they consisted, of what singular piety and sanctity of life, of how many nations, of what dignity in Gods Church, how great diligence they vsed to discusse this matter, what prayer, what conferringe of scriptures, and other meanes they vsed, and with how great consent of both Greeke and Latyn Church conforme to all antiquity, they determined and resolved against the opinion of Protestants in our dayes; he will easily discover, how much more reason, and probability of security there is, of aduenturinge his soule of the one side then of the other, which yet he will better do, by contemplation of the vanity of new Protestants arguments and objections, against so ancient founded and continued a truth, Which objections we shall examine in the Chapters followinge. And so much for this.

THE

THE STATE OF THE CHIEFE QUESTIONS handled in the forsaide disputations,

*Concerninge the reall presence, Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Masse,
vvith the chiefe groundes that
be on eyther side.*

CHAP. II.

THE questions that were most treated, and
vrged on both sides, at the two changes of
Religion vnder *K. Edward* and *Q. Mary*, were
principally three, all concerninge the Sacra-
ment of the Altar, as before hath byn shewed:
The first about the *reall presence* of Christ in the
said Sacrament: the second concerninge the
manner of his being there by *Transubstantiation*:
and the third about the same as it is a *Sacrifice*.
Which three points of Catholike doctrine
being left by *K. Henry* the 8. standinge in vi-
gour, as he had found them deliuered, and pre-
serued by all his ancestours Kings of England,
from the beginninge of our conuersion vnto
Christian Religion, they were all changed
within two yeares after the said Kings death,
by authority of his sonne, being then some-
what lesse then a dozen yeares ould, and by
force

See the
booke of
statutes
an. 2 & 3.
Edw. 6.

How dis-
orderly
Catholike
Religion
was over-
throwne
in K. Ed-
wards
dayes.

force of a certayne act of parliament, confir-
med by his name intituled: *An act for the vnifor-
mity of seruice and administration of Sacraments, &c.*
Which act though in shew yt conteyned no-
thing els, but the admission and approbation
of a certayne new booke of *Common-prayer and
administration of Sacraments* (for so are the words
of the Statute) gathered together by *Cranmer,
Ridley*, and some others of the same humor, yet
for that in this new communion booke, to-
gether with many other articles of auncient
beleefe, these three also of the *reall presence,
Transubstantiation*, and *Sacrifice* were altogether
altered, and a new manner of faith therein
taught, yt was giuen forth that all was esta-
blished and setled by Parliament: and for that
this collection of new articles of beleefe, pas-
sed, as yow haue heard, in a bundell or fardell
shuffled vp together in hast, vnder the name
of a reformed booke of *Common-prayer*, with-
out any great examination or dispute about
the particulars, but in generall only takinge
voyces in the parliament house, as well of lay-
men as other learned and vnlearned, whether
the booke should passe, or noe; wherein the
L. Seymour Protector and his crew, hauing the
Kings authority in their hands, and gettinge
Cranmer and *Ridley* on their sides for loue of
weomen, and other preferment, easily pre-
uayled, as by the statute yt selfe may appeare:
yt was thought expedient, as before hath byn
noted, that presently after the statute publi-
shed, two meanes should be vsed for authori-
zinge

zinge
by per
and di
before
by imp
and o
should
to res
Vinch
fed the
maine
where
shewe
and pu
ball au
& tem
Northu
lower
Latym
2. F
Q. Mar
pittifu
ynluck
like P
faith a
of the
woun
fect th
correc
but in
iustice
were
by and

zing and better crediting the same. The one by perswasion of diuers meetings, conferences, and disputations of the learned sort, which before yow haue heard related; and the other by imprisonment & depriuing such Bishops, and other cheefe Ecclesiasticall persons, as should shew themselues most forward or able to resist this course, which they began with *Vinchester, Durham, and London*: And thus passed they on for those 4. or 5. yeares that remained of *K. Edwards* raigne after this change, wherein notwithstandinge, almighty God shewed wonderfully his hand of iudgement and punishment soone after, vpon the principall authors of this innouation both spirituall & temporall; as of the later, both the *Seamours, Northumberland, Suffolke*, and diuers of their followers; of the former *Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Latimer*, & the like, as to the world is euident.

2. For vpon this followed the raigne of *Q. Mary* for other 4. or 5. yeares, who seeing so pittifull a breach made in the realme by this vn lucky alteration, she as a zealous Catholike Princeesse, endeauored to restore the old faith and Religion againe, to the former vnity of the vniuersall Church, and close vp the wound that had byn made, vsinge to this effect the selfe same meanes of instruction and correction, by arguments and punishments, but in different manner, and with farre vnlike iustice of proceeding. For that the arguments were the very same, which euer had byn vsed by ancient Fathers, against old heretiks in the like

The entrance of
Q. Mary.

like controuerſies: and the punishments were no other then ſuch, as auncient Eccleſiaſticall Cannons did preſcribe, and were vſed only towards them, that eyther had byn cheefe authors of the innouations, or ſtood ſo obſtinately in defence therof, as by no meanes they could be recalled.

3. Now then yt is to be conſidered, which of theſe two ſorts of people had more ground or reaſon, either thoſe, that withſtood the firſt change in *K. Edwards* dayes, which was from the old accuſtomed Religion to a new: or thoſe that reſiſted the ſecond change or exchange vnder *Q. Mary*, which was nothinge els indeed but a returne from the new to the old againe. And heerby will appeare the ſtate of the controuerſie vvhich now vve are to handle. For as for the firſt ſort, to witt Catholiks, the hithertoall ſtate of their controuerſie is manifeſt, concerninge theſe three queſtions about the Sacrament; for that no man can deny, but that the doctrine of the firſt, and third, which is the *reall preſence*, and *Sacrifice*, had byn receaued and held for true throughout England, (wherein concurred alſo the vvhole Chriſtian vvorlde abroad) from the tyme before by me prefixed of our firſt conuerſion, and more, euen from the Apoſtles dayes: neyther could any tyme be appointed, or memory brought forth, when, how, or by whome, the ſaid doctrines had their beginnings in England, or els where, which accordinge to *S. Auguſtines* rule, and diuers particular

The ſtate
of the cō-
trouerſie
in three
queſtions.

demon-

demonstrations layd downe by vs before, in the first part of the *Treatise of three Conuerfions*, doth evidently couuince, that they came from Christ, and his Apostles themselues; vvhich ought to be sufficient, though no other proofes of Scriptures, Fathers, Doctors, and Councells could be shewed in particular for the same, as may be almost infinite, and some yow shall heare a little after in this Chapter.

4. And as for the second question of *Transubstantiation*, though yt be but a certayne appendix of the first, about the manner how Christ is really in the Sacrament, as * before hath byn shewed, & was not so particularly declared, and defined by the Church in this very tearme of *Transubstantiation*, vntill some 400. yeares gone in the generall Councell of *Lateran*, (as neyther the doctrine of *homusian* or *consubstantiality* was, vntill 300. yeares after Christ in the Councell of Nice; neyther the dignity of *theotocos*, wherby the blessed Virgin is called the Mother of God, vntill the Councell of *Ephesus* about 400. yeares after Christ:) yet was the same doctrine euer true before from the beginninge, and vttered by the Fathers in other equiualent words & speeches, of *changes*, and *Transmutations of natures*, *conuerfions of substances*, and the like; and when there had not byn such other eident proofes extant for the truth therof; yet the consent and agreement of so great and vniuersall a Councell of Christendome, as the said *Lateran* was, wherein

Aug. l. 3. de baptis. c. 7. l. 4. c. 6. & 24. & l. 5 c. 23.

* *Sup. cap. preced.*

anno 1215

The names of consubstantiality, of Mother of God, and Transubstantiation, determined after one manner.

both

both the Greeke and Latyn Church agreed; and after great and longe searche by readinge, disputinge, prayinge, conferringe of Scriptures and Fathers, and other such meanes, concluded this doctrine to be truth: Yf there had byn (I say) nothinge els for English Catholiks to rest vpon in this point, but the generall consent, and agreement of so learned, holy, and venerable an assembly; yt might iustly seeme sufficient in the sight of an indifferent or reasonable man to weygh, and ouerweygh, against the particular iudgements of all the innouators of any age to the contrary; and so no maruayle, though they stood so earnest against that innouation, this being the state of the controuersie on their part.

The state
of the
question
for the
Prote-
stants.

5. But now for the Protestants, the state of their question was farre different. For first, whereas *Martyn Luther* about the 9. or 10. yeares of *K. Henryes* raigne, had begon some noueltyes about the second and third question of *Transubstantiation* and *Sacrifice*, holding still the first of the *reall presence* for firme, and that three of his first schollers *Oecolampadius*, *Carolstadtus*, and *Zuinglius* full sore against his will, takinge occasion of his innouations, had added others of their owne, about the said first question, denyinge the *reall presnce*, though in different sorts: and that after them againe *Iohn Caluyn* a French-man, had diuised a third manner of beleefe therin, not a little different from them all about the said doctrine, both affirminge & denyinge the *reall presence* in different manner and

and sound of words: yt seemed good to our English Protestants at that tyme, or the more part therof, to choose the last and newest opinion of all, and to establish yt by parliament, banishinge thervpon the ould faith, that euer yntill that day had byn held and beleueed in our countrey, as well by themselves as others. 6. And thus came in the first new Religion into England, by some shew of publike authority, which being sett forth with so great applause, and ostentation both of publike disputations, colloquyes, conferences, lectures, preachings, exposition of scriptures, and consent of Parliament, as yow haue heard, did partly by this outward shew and ostentation of authority, partly by the pleasinge face of nouelty yt selfe, and sweet freedome that yt brought from all former Ecclesiasticall discipline, so infect, and enchaunt the harts, iudgements, & affections of diuers of the common people, and some also of the learned, (but the lighter, and more licentious sort) as afterward when *Q. Mary* came to take accoumpt, and would recall them againe to the station which they had forsaken; they chose rather of pride and obstinacy, to suffer any thinge, yea to dye, and go to the fire, then to renounce these new fancies once fastened vpon them: into which pertinacity the same of the forsaide Protestants disputations, did not a little animate them; for that yt was giuen out generally (and so doth Fox stand stiffely in the same) that the Sacramentaryes had the vpper hand in

Motives
that drew
in new
Religion.

in all, as well against the Lutherans in the first question of *reall presence*, as against the Catholiks in that and all the rest: vvhich bragge how vayne yt was, will appeare after when we come to examine their arguments in particular.

7. But yet before we come to that, two other points seeme expedient to be performed, for better direction of the readers vnderstandinge in these high misteryes of our faith: the first to see what sure grounds the Catholiks had, and haue at this day to stand firme, and immoueable in their old beleefe about these articles, notwithstandinge any plausible or deceytfull arguments of sense and reason, that may be brought against them; & secondly certayne obseruations, wherby the force or rather fraud of hereticall obiections may be discouered, which so beguyled many simple people in *Q. Maryes* dayes, and made them runne headlonge to their perdition; the first of these points I shall handle in this Chapter: the second in the next that followeth.

Catholike groundes of these three articles, and first of the reall presence.

§. I.

8. The first ground that Catholike men haue of these, and all other misteryes of Christian faith

faith that are about the reach of common
 sense and reason, is the authority of the Ca-
 tholike Church, by which they were taught
 the same: as points of faith reuealed from
 God. And this is such a ground, as we see by
 experience, that the most part of people of
 what Religion soeuer, being yonge or vnlearn-
 ed, can yeld no other reason in effect, why
 they beleue this or that article of theire faith,
 but for that they receaued the same from their
 Church and teachers therof, being not able
 themselves to searche out any other grounde
 therof: yea the most learned of all from their
 infancy, tooke all vpon ~~this assurance~~ only of
 their Church, which Church yf they held to
 be of infallible authority, so as she can neither
 be deceaued nor deceaue (as we do of the Ca-
 tholike) then should they rest firme & sure in
 their opinion vpon this ground; but yf they
 should that all Churches may erre, and bringe
 into error both in doctrine, and manners, as
 yow haue heard *Martyn Bucer* hold before in
 his *Cambridge* conclusions, and most sectaries
 of our tyme do follow him in that assertion,
 then can they haue no ground or certainty
 this way, but each man and woman must
 seeke other grounds and proofes, and stand
 vpon their owne iudgements for triall of the
 same, which how well the most part of people
 can do, being eyther yonge, simple, vnlearn-
 ed, or otherwayes so busied in other mat-
 ters, as they cannot attend therunto, euery
 man of meane discretion will consider, and

Sup. cap. 13

C

confe-

consequently they must needs be said both to live and dye, vvithout any ground of their faith at all, but proper opinion, and so perish euerlastingly.

9. The famous Doctor *S. Augustine* handleth this matter in a speciall booke to his frend *Honoratus* deceaued by the Manichies, as himselfe also sometymes had byn, and he intituleth his booke *De vtilitate credendi*: of the profit that commeth to a man by beleeuing the Church, and points of faith therein taught, without demaunding reason or prooffe therof, which the Manichies derided, and said that they required nothinge to be beleeued of their followers, but that which first should be proued to them by good prooffe and reason, and not depend only of mens credit: but the holy Father scorneth this hereticall bragg and ostentation of theirs, and commendeth highly the contrary custome of simple beleeuinge vpon the credit of the Catholike Church, for that otherwise infinite people should haue no faith at all, and exhorteth his frend *Honoratus* to take the same course; first to beleeuue, and after to seeke the reason. His discourse is this: *Fac nos nunc primum querere, cuiam Religioni, animas nostras, &c.* Suppose that we now first of all did
 „ seeke, vnto what Religion we should commit
 „ our soules to be purged and rectified; without
 „ all doubt we must begin with the Catholike
 „ Church, for that she is the most eminent now
 „ in the world, there being more Christians in
 „ her, at this day, then in any other Church of

*Aug. lib. de
vtil. cred.
tom. 6.
cap. 7.*

Iewes,

Iewes, and Gentills put together: And albeit
amongst these Christians, there may be sects
and heresies, and all of them would seeme to
be Catholiks, and do call others besides them-
selues heretiks: yet all graunt, that yf we con-
sider the whole body of the world, there is
one Church amongst the rest more eminent
then all other, & more plentiful in number,
& (as they which know her do affirme) more
sincere also in truth; but as concerninge truth,
we shall dispute more afterward; now yt is
sufficient for them that desire to learne, that
there is a Catholike Church, which is one in
yt selfe, whervnto diuers heretiks do feigne,
and diuise diuers names, wheras they, (and
their sects) are called by peculiar names,
which themselves cannot deny, wherby all
men that are indifferent, & not letted by pas-
sion, may vnderstand vnto what Church, the
name Catholike, which all parts desire & pre-
tend, is to be giuen.

10. Thus *S. Augustine*: teachinge his frend
how he might both know and beleue the
Catholike Church, and all that shee taught
simply, and without asking reason or prooffe.
And as for knowing and discerning her from
all other Churches, that may pretend to be
Catholike, we heare his marks, that she is
more eminent, vniuersall, greater in number,
and in possession of the name Catholike. The
second that she may be beleued securely, and
cannot deceaue nor be deceaued in matters of
faith, he proueth elswhere, concluding finally

*Aug. ibid.
cap. 8.*

in this place: *Si iam satis tibi iactatum videris, &c.*
Yf thou dost seeme to thy selfe now to haue
” byn sufficiently tossed vp and downe amonge
” sectaryes, and wouldst putt an end to these
” labours and tormoyles, follow the way of
” Cath. discipline, which hath flowen downe
” vnto vs from Christ by his Apostles, and is to
” flow from vs to our posterity.

How a
man may
know the
Catholike
Church.

*Aug. de ve-
ravel. c. 7.
& serm.
131. de
temp. &
lib. 3. cont.
Gaudens.
Donat. c. 1.*

11. This then is the iudgement and direction
of *S. Augustine*, that a man should for his first
ground, in matters of faith, looke vnto the be-
leeefe of the greatest & most eminent Church
of Christendome, that hath endured longest,
embraceth most people, & hath come downe
from our fore-fathers with the name of Ca-
tholike, not only among her owne professors,
but euen among her enemyes Iewes, infidells,
and heretiks, and so is termed & held by them
in their common speach, as the said Father in
diuers others places declareth at large. Which
rule of direction, yf we will follow about
these three articles of faith now proposed, the
reall presence, *Transubstantiation*, and *Sacrifice of the
masse*, yt is easily seene what ground we haue
for their beleeefe, in this kind of prooffe, so
highly esteemed by *S. Augustine*, which is the
authority of the vniuersall Cath. Church.
For that when *Luther* and his followers began
to oppose themselues in our dayes, no man
can deny, but that our beleeefe in these articles
was generally receaued ouer all Christen-
dome, as well *Asia* and *Africa*, where soeuer
Christians be, as *Europe*, and so vpward tyme

out

out of mynd; neither can any beginning be assigned to these doctrines in the Cath. Church, but only a certayne definition and determination of some Councells, about the name of Transubstantiation, as after shalbe declared.

12. Now then, hauinge found out this first ground which *S. Augustine* and other Fathers do make so great account of, which is the authority and beleefe of that Church, that generally is called Catholike: Yf we passe further, and see what grounds this Church had or hath to admytt the same, (which yet is not needfull, or possible to all sortes of men, for that only can be done by the learned sort) we shall find that she hath such grounds, as may conuince any man that is not obstinate, and indurate to the contrary. And first to begin with the article of the *reall presence*, what ground, prooffe, or Theologicall demonstration can there bee, which the Cath. Church hath not for her beleefe in that high mystery? which as it was to be one of the cheefest, most sacred, and admirable of Christian Religion, so was yt meet that yt should be confirmed, by all the principall wayes that any article of faith could or can be confirmed, that is to say both by scriptures of the ould and new Testament, and the true exposition therof by auncient Fathers, that liued before this controuersie began with Sacramentaries; by authority and tradition of the Apostles and their successors; by testimony of auncient Fathers from age to age; by consent and agreement,

Groundes
about the
reall presence.

practise and vse of the vniuersall Church; by the concurrence and approbation of almighty God, with euident and infinite miracles, by confession of the aduersaryes, and other such generall heads of arguments, which Catholike diuines do produce for this truth, for iustifyinge the Churches faith therein.

Demon-
strations
out of the
scripture.

13. And out of the scriptures their demonstration is not single or of one sort only, but in diuers manners, as to the height and dignity of so diuine and venerable a mystery was conuenient. For that out of the ould Testament, they shew how yt was prefigured and prophesied, and in the new both promised againe, exhibited, and confirmed, and this not by exposition of their owne heads only, as sectaryes do, but by intendement, and interpretation, of the grauest and most ancient Fathers, that haue liued in the Church of God from age to age, who vnderstood so the said figures and foreshewinges of the old Testament. As for example, the bread and wine mysteriously offered to almighty God by *Melchisedeck* King and Priest, who bare the type of our Sauour *Gen. 14. Psalm. 109. Heb. 7.* The *shew-bread* amonge the Iewes, that only could be eaten by them that were sanctified *Exod. 40. & 1. Reg. 21.* The bread sent miraculously by an Angell to *Elias*, whereby he was so strengthened, as he trauiayled 40. dayes without eating by vertue only of that bread. These three sorts of bread to haue byn expresse figures of this Sacrament, and of the trew flesh of

Three fi-
gures of
Christs
flesh in
bread.

of C
conf
lib. 2
lib. 4
Chry
Petil.
Euseb
14-
fed i
more
Exod.
descri
Chri
Testa
of the
so ser
figur
wor
Apol
infer
great
thing
then
shade
prob
Chri
be on
ment
gures
the ch
confe
bread
streng

of Christ therein contained, do testifie by one consent all the ancient Fathers, as *S. Cyprian lib. 2. epist. 3. Clem. Alexand. lib. 4. Strom. Ambros. lib. 4. de Sacram. cap. 3. Hier. in cap. 1. ad Titum. Chrysost. hom. 35. in Gen. August. lib. 2. cont. litteras Petil. cap. 37. Cyrill. Catechesi 4. Mystag. Arnobius, Eusebius, Gregorius, and many others.*

14 Three other figures there are not expressed in the forme of bread, but in other things more excellent then bread, as the paschall lambe *Exod. 12. Leuit. 23.* The blood of the Testament described *Exod. 24. Heb. 9.* And fulfilled by Christ *Luc. 22.* when he said: *This cupp is the new Testament in my blood,* and againe: *This is my blood of the new Testament Matth. 26.* The manna also sent by God from heauen was an expresse figure of this Sacrament, as appeareth by the words of our Sauour. *Ioan. 6.* and of the Apostle *1. Cor. 10.* Out of all which figures, is inferred, that for so much as there must be great difference betweene the figure, and the thing prefigured, no lesse yf we beleue *S. Paul,* then betweene a shaddow, & the body whose shaddow yt is; yt cannot be imagined by any probability, that this Sacrament exhibited by Christ, in performance of those figures, should be only creatures of bread and wine, as Sacramentaries do imagine, for then should the figures be eyther equall, or more excellent then the thing prefigured yt selfe, for who will not confesse but that bread for bread, *Elias* his bread made by the Angell, that gaue him strength to walke 40. dayes vpon the vertue

Three
other
signes of
Christ's
flesh.

Exod. 16

*Coloss. 2.
Heb. 10.*

An inference vpon the former figures.

3. Kings 19:

therof was equall to our English-ministers Communion-bread, and that the *manna* was much better.

15. And yf they will say for an euasion, as they do, that their bread is not common bread, but such bread as being eaten and receaued by faith, worketh the effect of Christs body in them, and bringeth them his grace; we answere that so did these figures and Sacraments also of the ould Testament, being receaued by faith in Christ to come, as the ancient Father and Preachers receaued them: And for so much as Protestants do further hould, that there is no difference betweene the vertue & efficacy of those old Sacraments, and ours, (which we deny) yt must needs follow, that both we & they agreeing, that the Fathers of the old Testament beleueed in the same Christ to come that we do now, being come, their figures and shaddowes must be as good as our truth in the Sacrament, that was prefigured, if it remaine bread still after Christs institution, and consecration. But Catholike Fathers did vnderstand the matter farre otherwise, and to alleage one for all, for that he spake in the sense of all in those dayes, *Saint Hierome* talking of one of those forsaide figures, to witt, of the *shew-bread*, and comparinge yt with the thing figured, and by Christ exhibited, saith thus: *Tantum interest, &c.* There is so much difference betweene the *shew-bread*, and the body of Christ figured therby, as there is difference betweene the shaddow and the body,

vit 24:5.

Hier. in
genuit.
in p. m. m.
cap. ad Th.
2470.

body, whose shaddow yt is, and betweene an
image and the truth, which the Image repre-
senteth, & betweene certaine shapes of things
to come, and the things themselues prefigured
by those shapes. And thus much of figures, &
presignifications of the old Testament.

6. In the new Testament, as hath byn said,
are conteyned both the promise of our Sau-
iour, to fullfill these figures with the truth of
his flesh, which he would giue to be eaten in
the Sacrament, as also the exhibition and per-
formance therof afterward, the very night
before his passion, with a miraculous confir-
mation of the same by *S. Paul*, vpon conference
had therin with Christ himselfe after his bles-
sed assension. The promise is conteyned in the
sixt Chapter of *S. Iohns* gospell, where our
Sauiour foretellethe expressely, that he would
giue his flesh to vs to be eaten: *for that except
vve did eat the same, vve could not be saued: that his
flesh vvas truly meat, and his blond truly drinke; and
that his flesh that he would giue vs to eat, vvas
the same that vvas to be giuen for the life of the world:*
All which speeches of our Sauour expoun-
ded vnto vs in this sense, for the *reall presence* of
his flesh in the Sacrament by the vniuersall
agreeinge consent of auncient Fathers, must
needs make great impressiō in the hart of a
faithfull Christian man, especially the perfor-
mance of this promise ensuing soone after,
vwhen Christ being to depart out of this
world, and to make his last will and Testa-
ment, exhibited that which heere he promi-
sed,

Prooves
out of the
new Te-
stament.

10. 6.

Matth. 26.

Marc. 14.

Luc. 22.

fed, takinge bread, brake and distributed the same, sayinge : *this is my body that shalbe deliuered for you*, which words are recorded by three seuerall Euangelists, and that with such significant, and venerable circumstances on our Sauiours behalfe, of feruent prayer, washinge his Apostles feet, protestation of his excessiue loue, and other deuout, and most heauenly speaches in that nearnesse to his passion, as well declared the exceeding greatnesse of the mystery which he was to institute: whervnto if we add that excellent cleare cōfirmation of *S. Paul*, who for resoluing doubts as it seemed had conference with Christ himselfe after his ascension (for before he could not, he being no Christian when Christ ascended) the matter will be more euident. His words are these to the *Corinth*. *Ego enim accepi à Domino, quod & tradi di vobis, &c.* For I haue receaued from our Lord himselfe, that which I haue deliuered vnto you about the Sacrament; and do you note the word (*for*) importinge a reason why he ought specially to be beleued in this affayre, for so much as he had receaued the resolution of the doubt frō Christ himselfe. And then he setteth downe the very same words againe of the Institution of this Sacrament, that were vsed by Christ before his passion, without alteration, or new exposition, which is morally most certayne that he would haue added for clearinge all doubts, yf there had byn any other sense to haue byn gathered of them, then the plaine words themselues do beare.

Nay

A. Cor. 11.

S. Pauls
confirma-
tion of
the reall
presence.

Nay himfelfe doth add a new confirmation, when he faith, that he which doth eate and drinke vnworthily this Sacrament, *reus erit corporis & sanguinis Domini*, shalbe guilty of the body and bloud of our Lord. And againe: *Iudicium sibi manducat & bibit, non dijudicans corpus Domini*, he doth eat & drinke his owne iudgement, not discerninge the body of our Lord: Which inferreth the *reall presence* of Christs body, which those, whome the Apostle reprehendeth, by the fact of their vnworthy recea-ving doe so behaue themselues, as yf they did not discern it to be present. All which laid together, & the vniforme consent of expositors throughout the whole Christian world, concurringe in the selfe-same sense and meaning of all these scriptures, about the *reall presence* of Christs true body in the Sacrament, you may imagine what a motiue yt is, and ought to be to a Catholike man, who desireth to beleue, and not to striue and contend. And thus much for scriptures.

17. There followeth the consideration of Fathers, Doctors and Councells; wherein as the Sacramentaries of our tyme, that pleased first to deny the *reall presence*, had not one authority, nor can produce any one at this day, that expressely faith, that Christs reall body is not in the Sacrament, or that yt is only a figure, signe, or token therof (though diuers impertinent peeces of some Fathers speeches they will now and then pretend to alleage) so on the cōtrary side, the Catholiks do behould for

The second ground about authorities of Fathers.

for their comfort, the whole ranks of ancient Fathers through euery age, standinge with them in this vndoubted truth: Yea not only affirming the same *reall presence* in most cleere,

See *Claud.*
de Xanthes
reper. &
Bellarmin. l.
de Euchar.
tom 2. and
others.

and perspicuous words (wherof yow may see whole books in Catholike wryters replenished with Fathers authorities, laid togeather out of euery age from Christ downewards) but that which is much more, yeldinge reasons, & endeauoring to proue the same by manifest arguments, & theologicall demonstrations, vsing therein such manner of speach and words, as cannot possibly agree vnto the Protestants communion of bare bread and wyne, with their symbollicall signification or representation only. As for example, where the Fathers do shew how Christs true flesh cometh to be in this Sacramēt, *videlicet: by the true conuersion of bread into his body*, and by, *that this body is made of bread*, and by, *that the substances of bread and vvyne be changed*, and other like speaches, as may be seene in *S. Ambrose 4. de Sacram. cap. 5. & lib. 6. cap. 1. lib. de myst. init. cap. 9. Cypr. Sermon de Cæna. Chrysost. hom. 83. in Matth. & de proditiõne Iuda. Cyrill. Catech. 4. Mystag. Nissenus orat. Catech. 37. and others.*

The first
reason of
the Fa-
thers.

The second
reason of
Fathers.

18. Secondly, yt is an ordinary speach of the Fathers, to cry out & admyre the miracle that happeneth, by the conuersion in this Sacrament, ascribinge the same to the supreme omnipotency of almighty God, as yow may see in *S. Chrysostome l. 3. de sacerdotio: O miraculum, &c. S. Ambrose lib. 4. de Sacram. cap. 4. Iustinus Martyr*

Apolog.

Apolog. 2. sayinge : that by the same omnipotency of God, vvhetherby the vvord vvas made flesh, the flesh of the vvord vvas made to be in the Eucharist, which agreeth not to a Caluinian communion.

9. Thirdly, some of them do extoll and magnifie the exceeding loue & charity of Christ towards vs, aboue all other humane loue, in that he feedeth vs with his owne flesh, which no shephards did euer their sheepe, or mothers their children, which is the frequent speech of S. Chrysostome hom. 83. in Matth. & 45. in Ioan. & hom. 24. in ep. 1. ad Cor. 2. & homil. 60. & 61. ad Pop. Antioch. And to the same effect S. Augustine ep. 120. cap. 27 & in Psal. 33. which speeches can no wayes agree to the Protestants supper.

The third reason.

10. Fourthly, diuers of the said Fathers do expressely teach, that we do receaue Christ in the Sacrament not only by faith, but truly, really, and corporally; *semetipsum nobis commiscet* (saith S. Chrysostome) *non fide tantum, sed & reipsa*: Christ doth ioyn himselfe with vs (in the Sacrament) not only by faith, but really. And in another *place, he putteth this antithesis or opposition betwixt vs, and the *Magi*, that saw and beleeued in Christ lyinge in the manger, that they could not carry him with them, as we do now by receauinge him in the Sacrament, and yet no doubt they beleeued in him, and carryed him in faith as we do now; to which effect S. Cyrill Alexand. saith: *Corporaliter nobis filius vnitur vt homo. spiritualiter, vt Deus*: Christ as a man is vnited vnto vs corporally, (by the Sacrament) and spiritually, as he is God.

The 4. reason.

Chrysost. hom. 60. ad Popul. Antioch.

*De Sanctis Phylagorio.

4. in Ioan. cap. 13. & 14. & 1. 11. cap. 27.

Wher-

Whervnto yow may add *S. Hilary lib. 8. de Trinitate*, and *Theódorus* in the Councell of *Ephesus tom. 6. Appendic. 5. cap. 2.* and others.

The fifth
reason.

*Lib. 4. cont.
hars. 8. 34.*

Ibidem.

*Hom. 3. in
Matth.*

The sixth
reason.

21. Firtly the Fathers do many tymes, and in diuers places, and vpon sundry occasions go about to proue the truth of other mysteryes, and articles of our faith, by this miracle of the being of Christs flesh and body in the Sacrament, as *S. Irenaus* for example, doth proue Christs Father to be the God of the old Testament, for that in his creatures he hath left vs his body & bloud, and in the same place he vseth the same argument, for establishinge the article of the resurrection of our bodyes, to witt, that he that vouchsafeth to nowrish vs with his owne body and bloud, will not lett our bodyes remayne for euer in death & corruption. *S. Chrysostome* in like manner, by the truth of his *reall presence* in the Sacrament, doth confute them that denyed Christ to haue taken true flesh of the Virgin Mary, which hardly would be proued by the Sacramentary supper of bread and wyne, as euery man by himselfe will consider.

22. Sixtly to pretermitt all other points handled to this effect, by the said Fathers, as that diuers of them do exclude expressely the name of figure, or similitude from this Sacrament, as *S. Ambrose lib. 4. de Sacram. cap. 1. Damasc. lib. 4. cap. 4. & 14. Theophilaſt. in Matth. 26.* Others yeld reasons why Christ in the Sacrament, would be really vnder the formes or accidents of bread and wyne, to witt, that our

faith

faith might be proued and exercised therby,
 & the horror of eating flesh & bloud, in their
 owne forme & shape, taken away, and so the
 same *S. Ambrose Ibid. l. 4. de Sacram. c. 4. Cyrill. in*
cap. 22. Luc. apud D. Thom. in catena, Others do
 perswade vs not to beleue our senses that see
 only bread and wyne, wherof we shall speake
 more in the obseruations following: so *S. Au-*
gustine, serm. de verbis Apost. & l. 3. de Trinit. cap. 10.
 Others do proue this reall presence by the sa-
 crifice, affirminge the selfe same Christ to be
 offered now in our dayly sacrifice vpon the
 Altars of Christians, after an vnbloudy man-
 ner, which was offered once bloudely vpon
 the Altar of the Crosse, as more largely shalbe
 shewed: so *S. Chrysostome hom. 17. ad Hebr. & 2.*
ad Tim. Greg. lib. 4. dial. c. 58. Nissenus orat. 1.
in pascha, &c. All these considerations I say, and
 many others that may be taken out of the Fa-
 thers wrytinges, I do for breuityes sake lett
 passe in this place, though most euidently they
 do declare the said Fathers plaine meaninge,
 and beleefe in this article, and cannot any way
 be applyed to the new Communion of Pro-
 testants, but by manifest impropriety and de-
 ortion.

Diuers
 euident
 reasons
 togather.

3. And therfore I will end only with one
 consideration more, very ordinary with the
 said Fathers, which is, the diuine reuerence,
 honour, and adoration, that in all ages the said
 Fathers haue giuen vnto the blessed Sacra-
 ment, whose authorityes were ouerlong heere
 to recyte in particular. The sayinge of *S. Austen*
 is

The sea-
 uenth rea-
 son.

Aug. conc.
1. in pf. 18.

Chrysost.
hom. 3. in
epist. ad
Ephes.
Theodor. in
2. dialog.

Chrysost.
hom. 60. ad
Popul. An-
tuch. &
hom. 3. in
ep. ad Ephes.
& lib. 6. de
Sacerdotio.

The third
ground of
Councells.

Theodoretus
in 3. Dial.

is knowne *Nemo manducat nisi prius adorauerit*, no man eateth the Sacrament but first adored the same, and *S. Chrysostome*, *Adora & manduca* adore yt and receaue yt; And *Theodoret* to the same effect, *Et creduntur & adorantur, quod ea sunt qua creduntur*. They are beleeued and adored (the flesh and blood of Christ) for that they are indeed the things they are beleeued to be. And to speake nothinge of many other Fathers sayings to this effect, *S. Chrysostome* his large discourses about this matter may serue for all who wryteth, that at the tyme of consecration and sacrifice, the very Angells come downe, and vnto tremblinge do adore Christ their Lord therein present vvhich he vwould neuer haue vvrytten, y bread, and wyne were only there present.

24. By all these wayes & meanes then, may easily be seene what the auncient Fathers in their ages did thinke, speake, and beleeu, of this high & admirable mistery of Christs real presence in the Sacrament. And albeit there were no Councells about this matter, for the space of a thousand yeares after Christ, the cause therof was, that in all that space no one man euer openly contradicted the same, at least after the tyme of *S. Ignatius* vntill *Berengarius*, (for yf any man had done yt, we may see by the foresaid Fathers speeches, who must haue byn the chiefe in these Councells, whate their determination would haue byn against them) and when the said *Berengarius* had once broached this Sacramentary heresy, the whole Christian world rose vp presently against the

same

same, as against a blasphemous nouelty, and ten seuerall Councells condemned the same, as in the former Chapter hath byn declared.

25. Wherefore the Catholikes hauinge with them all these warrants of truth by scriptures, fathers, councells, tradition of antiquity, vni- forme consent of all Christian nations, both Greeke, Latyn, Asian, African, & other coun- treyes embracing the name & faith of Christ, and that no beginninge or entrance can be shewed of this doctrine in the said Church, nor any contradiction against yt when yt first entred: as on the cōtrary side the first offspring of the other, togeather with the place, author, tyme, manner, occasion, resistance, condem- nation, and other like circumstances are and may be authentically shewed, prooued and conuincied, yea that the very face of Christen- dome from tyme out of mynd, by their churches, altars, offerings, adoration, and manner of diuine seruice admittred euery where, without contradiction, doubt, or que- stion, do testifie the same: the truth moreouer therof being confirmed by so infinite con- course of manifest miracles, recorded by such authors, as no man with piety can doubt of their credit; the Catholiks I say hauinge all this mayne cloud of witnesses (to vse the Apostles words) for the testimony of this truth, and being practized and accustomed in the beleefe therof for so many ages togeather without interruption, and being moreouer that *Luther* himselfe, and all the learned of his side that

The 4.
ground of
the Chur-
thes con-
sent.

Miracles?
Hebr. 124

H were

were open professed enemyes in other things to the Catholike beleefe, yet in this protested the truth to be so euident, as they durst not impugne it, nay held the first impugnors thereof for damnable heretiks, addinge also heerevnto that *Zuinglius* the first chiefe author, confesseth himselfe to haue byn moued thervnto by a certayne extrauagant spiritt, which he saith he knew not, *whether yt was blacke or white*. All these things, I say, laid together, and the liues and manners considered of them, that haue held the one & the other faith; that is to say the infinite Saints of the one side, whome the Protestants themselues do not deny to haue byn Saints; and the qualities and conditions of the others, that first began, or since haue defended the new Sacramentary opinions: lett the discret reader iudge, whether the Catholiks of England had reason to stand fast in their old beleefe, against the innouations of our new Sacramentary Protestants in *K. Edwards* dayes. And the like shall yow see in the other articles that ensue of *Transubstantiation* and *Sacrifice*, dependinge of this first of the *reall presence*, as before yow haue heard. But much more will yow be confirmed in all this, when yow shall haue read ouer the disputations followinge, and scene the trifling arguments of the Sacramentaries in these weighty & important articles of our beleefe and the ridiculous euasions where: with they seek to auoyd, or delude the graue testimonyes of scriptures, and Fathers before mentioned

*Zuing. l. de
vs Sacra-
mentaria,*

Weighty
considera-
tions.

tioned. For thereby wilbe seene, that they
seeke not truth in deed with a good and sin-
cere conscience, & feare of Gods iudgements;
but only to escape and entertayne talke for
continuaunce of their faction, which ought
to be marked by the reader, yf he loue his
soule. And thus much for the grounds of the
reall-presence.

Groundes of Transubstantiation.

§. 2.

26. Touchinge the second question about
Transubstantiation, though yt be lesse princi-
pall then the former of the *reall-presence*, for
that yt conteyneth but the particular manner
how Christ is really in the Sacrament, & con-
sequently not so necessary to be disputed of
with Sacramentaryes, that deny Christ to be
there really at all, as before hath byn noted:
yet shall we briefly discouer the principall
grounds wheron Catholiks do stand, in this
receaued doctrine of the Church against Lu-
therans especially, who grauntinge the said
reall-presence, do hold that bread is there togea-
ner with our Sauours body: which Catho-
lics for many reasons do hould to be absurd.
And albeit the word *Transubstantiation* & par-
ticular declaration therof, was not so expresse-
ly sett downe in the Church vntill some 400.
yeares gone in the generall Councell of Late-

in yth 13th Cent.

run in opposition
Arian, who
of the
of the
her but not
mid.

Fathers
authori-
ties redu-
ced to
two
heads.

First head.

Catech. 4.
mystag.

Lib. de San-
cto Baptis-
mo non lo-
quimur.

ran vnder Pope Innocentius the third, as the word Trinity, Homousion, or Consubstantiality and cleere exposition thereof, was not vntill the Councell of Nice 300. yeares after Christ; yet was the truth of this doctrine held euer before in effect and substance, though in different words: to witt *mutation, transmutation, conuersion of bread into the body of Christ, transelementation*, and the like, which is proued by the perpetuall consent of doctrine, vttered by the ancient Fathers in this point from the beginning, which are recorded by Catholike writers of our dayes from age to age: and one only alleageth thirty and two, that wrote heereof before the Councell of *Lateran*, and are ouerlong to be recited in this place; only they may be reduced for more perspicuitie to two heads: the one of such as deny the substance of bread to remayne after the words of consecration; the other of such as do expressely auouch a conuersion of bread into Christs body.

27. Of the first sort, that deny bread to remaine, is *S. Cyrill* Bishop of Hierusalem, whose words are: *hoc sciens, ac pro certissimo habens, panem hunc, qui videtur a nobis, non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat, &c.* I'hou knowing and being certayne of this; that the bread which we see is not bread, notwithstanding it tast as bread, and the wyne which we see not to be wyne, but the bloud of Christ, though to the tast still seeme to be wyne. And *S. Gregory Nisse* *Panis iste panis est in initio communis, &c.* This

bread

bread at the beginnunge is comon bread, but „
 when yt is consecrated, yt is called, and is in „
 deed the body of Christ. Againe Eusebius: *Ante-* „
quam consecrentur, &c. Before consecration „
 there is the substance of bread and wyne, but „
 after the words of Christ, yt is his body and „
 bloud: All which do exclude, as yow see, „
 bread after consecration. And to the same ef- „
 fect S. Ambrose: *Panis hic, panis est, ante verba Sa-* „
cramentorum, sed vbi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit „
caro Christi. This bread before the words of the „
 Sacraments, is bread, but after the consecra- „
 tion, of bread is made the flesh of Christ. And „
 S. Chrysostome treating of this mystery, asketh „
 this question, and aunswereth the same. *Num* „
vides panem? num vinum? absit, ne sic cogites! Dost „
 thou see bread? dost thou see wyne heere? „
 God forbidd, thinke no such matter. And to „
 this same effect many others might be cyted, „
 but yt would grow to ouergreat prolixity.

Hom. 1. de
Pasce.

De Sacram.
cap. 4.

Hom. de
Euchar. an
Encom.

2. head.

in y^o 4^o Cont.

8. The second sort of testimonies that do „
 affirme conuersion and change of bread into „
 the body of Christ, are many more, yf we „
 would stand vpon their allegation, and in „
 place of all might stand S. Ambrose, whose faith „
 was the generall faith of Christendome in his „
 dayes; & he doth not only oftentimes repeat, „
 that by the words of Christ vttered by the „
 Priest vpon the bread, the nature & substance „
 therof is changed into the body and bloud of „
 Christ, but proueth the same by examples of „
 all the miraculous mutations & conuersions, „
 recorded in the old and new Testament. Pro-

Ambros. l.
de ijs qui
instantur
cap. 9.

bemus (saith he) *non hoc esse quod natura formauit, sed quod benedictio consecrauit, maioremque vim esse benedictionis quam natura, quia benedictione etiam ipsa natura mutatur.* Lett vs proue then (by all these other miracles) that this which is in the Sacrament, is not that which nature did frame (vsed bread and wyne) but that which the blessing hath consecrated, and that the force of blessing is greater then the force of nature; for that nature herselfe is changed by blessing; And againe: *Si tantum valuit sermo Elia, ignem de celo depoueret; non valebit sermo Christi, species mutet elementorum?* Yf the speech of Elyas was of such force, as yt could bring downe fire from heauen, shall not the words of Christ (in the Sacrament) be able to change the natures of the eleméts? *videlicet* (as I said before) of bread and wyne. And yet further: You haue read, that in the creation of the world, God said, and things were made, he commaunded, and they were created; that speech then of Christ, vvhich of nothing created that which was not before; shall yt not be able to exchange those things that are, into other things, vvhich they vvere not before? for yt is no lesse to giue new natures to things, then to chaunge natures, but rather more, &c.

Ambros.
ibid.

King: 9.
10. 11.

29. Thus reasoneth that graue and holy Doctor, to whome we might adioyne many more both before and after him, as namely S. Cyprian in his sermon of the supper of our Lord: *Panis iste quem, &c.* This bread which Christ gaue vnto his disciples being changed, not in shape, but in nature, is by the omnipotent

3. Cyprian.
de Cena
Domini.

tend

tency of the word made flesh. S. Cyrill Bishop
of Hierusalem proueth the same by example
of the miraculous turning of water into wine,
at the marriage of Cane in Galeley: *aquam mu-*
tauit in vinum (saith he &c.) Christ turned wa-
ter into wyne, by his only will, and is he not
worthy to be beleueed *quod vinum in sanguinem*
transmutauit, that he did chaunge wyne into
his bloud? For yf at bodily marriages he did
worke so wonderfull a miracle, why shall not
we confesse that he gaue his body and bloud
(in the Sacrament) to the children of the
spouse? wherfore with all certainty, let vs re-
ceau the body and bloud of Christ, for vnder
the forme of bread is giuen vnto vs his body,
and vnder the forme of wyne his bloud. Thus
hee of this miraculous chaunge, wherof Saint
Chrysostome treatinge also vpon S. Mathew wry-
teth thus: *Nos ministrorum locum tenemus, qui vero*
sanctificat & immutat, ipse est. We that are Priests,
should but the place of his ministers: (in this
great chaunge) for he who doth sanctifie all,
and maketh the chaunge, is Christ himselfe.
To like effect wryteth Eusebius Emisenus; *quando*
benedicenda, &c. When the creatures of bread
and wyne are layd vpon the Altar to be blef-
sed, before they are consecrated by the inuo-
cation of the holy Ghost, there is present the
substance of bread and wyne; but after the
words of Christ, there is Christs body and
bloud. And what maruayle yf he that could
create all by his word, *posset creata conuertere,*
could conuert, and chaunge those thinges

Cyrrill. Ca-
tech. my-
tag. 4.

Ham. 83.
in Matth.

Serm. de
corp. Do-
mini.

that he had created, into other natures?

30. I might alleage many other Fathers to this effect, but my purpose in this place doth not permitt yt: this shalbe sufficient for a tast, that the doctrine of conuersion or chaunge of bread and wyne, into the body and bloud of Christ, which is the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was not new at the tyme of the Councell of *Lateran*, but was vnderstood and held euer before, by the cheefe Fathers of the Catholike Church, yea and determined also by two Councells at Rome: and the first thereof

Lanfranc. l. de corp. Domini Guiz. l. 3. de corp. Domini & Ansel. ep. de corp. Domini.

generall, wherein was present our *Lanfranc* vpon the yeare of Christ 1060. vnder Pope *Nicolas* the second; and the other 19. yeares after vnder Pope *Gregory* the seauenth, & both of them aboue an hundred yeares before the Councell of *Lateran*, wherein notwithstanding is declared expressely this doctrine, of the chaunge of bread & wyne into the body and bloud of our Sauour, albeit not vnder the name of *Transubstantiation*; and yt is proued expressely out of the words of Christs institution, *This is my body*, which can haue no other probable exposition, but that the bread is chaunged into his body. And so yt is expounded by all the forsaide Fathers, and others that, before this controuersie fell out, interpreted the same words of our Sauour.

The consent of the vniuersall Church.

31. These grounds then had the English Catholiks in *K. Edwards* dayes to stand in the defence of this doctrine, that is to say, the cleere words of scripture so vnderstood by all anti-

quity,

quity, together with the assertions and assertions of all the Fathers, the determination of Councils presently upon the controversy first moved, and namely of that great famous *Lateran* Council, wherein concurred both the Greeke and Latyn Church, there being present, the Greeke patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Hierusalem*, 70. metropolitan Archbishops, and above a thousand and two hundred other Fathers of diuers states, & degrees, (compare this with a meeting of some twenty or thirty ministers impugninge the same.) All which hauinge disputed the matter, and considered as well by scripture, and by ancient tradition of the Fathers and vniuersall Cath. Church, what had byn held before, did with full agreement determine & declare this matter, accursinge whosoever should from that tyme forward, deny that doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. Which decree of that Council being receaued generally, without contradiction throughout the Christian world, hath byn confirmed by seauen other Councils since that tyme, as before we haue shewed. And let the discreet reader vveigh with himselfe, which party hath more security for yt selfe, eyther the Catholike that followed all this authority & consent of antiquity, or our new Protestants, that vpon fresh imaginations of their owne heads, diuised a new doctrine contrary to all this antiquity. And thus much of this article, for a tast of that which may be alleged for yt.

Lateran

Canon. 2.
& 3.

The great-
nesse of
the Late-
ran Coun-
cell.

Groundes for the sacrifice of the masse.

§. 2.

The state
of the ques-
tion.

32. The third question proposed to be handled in the foresaid disputations, was about the *sacrifice of the masse*, to witt, whether the selfesame body of our Lord, whose reall presence is proued in the first question, be not only a Sacrament in the Christian Church, as yt is receaued vnder a signe of bread and wyne by the Priest and communicants, but a sacrifice also, as yt is offered to God the Father by the Priest vpon the Altar; and whether this externall and visible sacrifice be appointed by Christ, to be iterated and dayly frequented in the Church vnto the worlds end, and this both for an externall worshipp peculiar to Christians, whereby they are distinguished from all other people, as also for propitiation of sinnes, by applyinge the meritt and vertue of the other bloody sacrifice of our Sauour on the Crosse once offered for all, and euer auayleable (as *S. Paul* at large declareth in his epistle to the Hebrewes) for sanctifyinge the redeemed: this then being the question, and this being a doctrine so generally receaued throughout the Christian world, both in the *Greeke, Latyn, Aethiopian, Armenian*, and other Christian Churches, as there was no doubt or question therof, when *Luther* and his offspring began;

began; yt fell out in England, that vnder the child King Edward his raigne, name & authority, that the L. Seymour protectour and his followers, with some few Priests that were weary of mafsinge, and desirous of marriage, but cheefly Cranmer and Ridley, Hooper, Latymer, and others, bad heads of the cleargy in those dayes, tooke vpon them to pull downe this publike vse of sacrifice, and afterward to examine, and call in question the doctrine therof. At which chaunge and suddayne innouation, neuer seene in England before, from the first day that Christian Religion entred vnder the Apostles, as all the realiuies and contreyes round about remayned astonished: so diuers notwithstanding of the lighter sort, enclyned to noueltyes, applauded to them, & followed their diuise; others more prudent and respectiue to their owne saluation, consideringe that there went more in this matter then the pleasure and fancies of a few particular men, stood constant in that, which before they had receaued, and that which generally they saw, and knew to be in vse throughout all Christendome without cōtradiction, which could not be by *S. Austens* rule, but that yt must needs come downe from the Apostles themselues, for so much as all opposite doctrine to that, which was first planted by them & receaued from them, could neuer be so generally admitted without contradiction.

33. Wherefore entringe into due consideration of this matter, whilst all the ruffe ran the other

*Aug. l. 2. de
baptis. c. 7.
lib. 4. cap. 6.
de 24. de
l. 5. c. 23.*

other way for 5. or 6. yeares space, vnder that King Child, and those other little tyrants that bare sway, and one destroyed the other by Gods iust iudgement vnder him. These good men (the Catholikes I meane) fell to search what grounds they had, or might find out for this so receaued a doctrine & practife, as this of the masse and sacrifice was. And first they found, that wheras the first insult of heretiks was against the very name of the masse, as a new diuised thinge without reason or signification; they found (I say) that it was a very ancient and vsuall word, for the externall sacrifice of Christians vpon the Altar, in the Latyn Church, for twelue hundred yeares past and downeward; in place wherof the *Grecians* haue vsed the word *Liturgie*, *Synaxie*, and the like, and this vse is not only to be shewed by the testimonyes of particular Fathers, as *Saint Ambrose*, *S. Augustine*, *S. Leo*, *S. Gregory*, *Victor Vticensis*, *Cassianus*, and other; but by whole Councells also, as by that of *Rome*, vnder *Pope Siluester* the first of 275. Bishops, held almost 1300. yeares gone; the second & fourth of *Carthage* held the next age after, and the Councell of *Agatha* in *France* the same age; the Councell of *Ilurdum* and *Valentia* in *Spaine*, and of *Orleance* in *France*, all about 1000. yeares gone, which was sufficient matter against the vanytry of heretiks, that condemned the name & the words: for example of *S. Ambrose* sayinge *Missam facere coepi, orare in oblatione Deum*. I began to say masse, and to pray

The se-
arch of
Catholikes
vnder R.
Edw. for
the grounds
of the
masse.

About the
name of
masse.

a l. 5 ep. 33.

b *Serm.* 91.

c l. 1. de

sep & serm.

237. in do-

mn. 19. post.

Pentecost.

c Ep. 81. ad

Dioscor &

28. ad episc.

Germ.

d l. ep. 12.

e l. 4. c. 10.

f Lib. 2 hist.

Vandal.

g Lib. 3. de

cant. ps. ord.

h Can. 1.

i In 2. Cong.

can. 3. & 4.

Ca. 84.

j Can. 47.

k Can. 4.

l Can. 1.

m Can. 28.

Ambros.

ibid.

pray
and t
for leg
this m
read v
this p
as the
more
then t
Ridley
libert
34.
for th
conte
crifice
such f
autho
the an
bent r
word
must r
hereti
fence,
holy E
quity
Sacr
ly. sac
syndin
Christ
sacrifi
the sa
autho
mall sa

pray to God in the oblation of the sacrifice,
and those of *S. Austen*: *In lectione qua nobis ad mis-* *Aug. ibid*
sa legenda est, audituri sumus. We shall heare of
this matter more in the lesson which is to be
read vnto vs at masse. These speeches I say, &
this practise of so ould learned & holy Priests,
as these and their fellowes were, did preuayle
more with the grauer sort of English people,
then the lightnesse & inconstancy of *Cranmer*
Ridley, and such other licentious Priests, as for
liberty fell to Apostasie.

34. And this for the name of the *masse*. But
for the nature and substance therof, which
conteyneth the externall true and proper sa-
cristice of the Christian Church, they found
such store of euident proofes, and most graue
authorities, as might stay, confirme and satis-
fye any mans mynd, that were not willfully
bent to the contrary. And whereas I do vse the
words of *externall, true and proper* sacrifice, yow
must remember therby the fraud of these new
heretiks, who, as before about the reall pre-
sence, did go about to delude all the sayings of
holy Fathers, and other testimonies of Anti-
quity, that spake of Christs reall being in the
Sacrament, by running to the words *spirituall-*
ly, sacramental, by faith, and the like: so heere
syndinge the whole torrent and streame of
Christian antiquity to stand for this Christian
sacristice, & to mention, reuerence, & auouch
the same; these fellowes for auoydinge their
authorities do runne from the proper exter-
nall sacrifice, wherof we treat, vnto the in-
ternall,

aphorizall &c.

ternall, and inuisible sacrifice of the mynd, wherof K. David saith, that a contrite spiritt is a sacrifice to God. And when this cannot serue, they run also to improper and metaphoricall externe sacrifices, such as are, *mortification of the body* Rom. 12. *sacrifice of thankesgivinge*, Psalm. 49. *Sacrifice of almes deedes*. Hebr. 13. and other such good works, which by a certayne analogy or proportion with the nature of proper sacrifices, are called also *sacrifice* in scriptures & by the Fathers, but improperly. To these then do our Prorestants runne, when they are pressed with the authorities of aun-
cient Fathers, that name the vse of Christian sacrifice in the Church, and will needs make vs beleue, that the Fathers ment not properly of any true visible or externall sacrifice, but eyther of inward or inuisible sacrifice of the hart, mynd, and good desire; or els of outward metaphoricall sacrifice of pious and vertuous workes.

35. But all these are fraudulent shifts to ouerthrow one truth by another. For as we do not deny, but that there is an inward and inuisible sacrifice of our mynd, in dedicatinge of our selues to God, and to the subiection of his Maiestie, without which the externall sacrifice is little worth to him that offereth the same: And as we graunt that all good works be sacrifices in a certayne sort, by some similitude they haue with true & proper sacrifices, for that they are offered vp to God in his honour; yet do we say, that this is from our pur-
pose

The description
of a true
externall
and visible
sacrifice.

pose in this place, who talke of a true proper
externall sacrifice offered vp to God, after a
peculiar sacred rite, or ceremonyes, by pecu-
liar men deputed to this office in acknow-
ledgement of Gods diuine power, maiestie,
and dominion ouer vs, & protestation of our
due subiection vnto him, such as were the ex-
ternall sacrifices in the law of nature, offered
vp by patriarks and heads of familyes, and by
Priests of Aarons order vnder the law of
Moyse, and by Christ and his Priests accor-
dinge to the order of *Melchisedech* in the new
law; and for so much as both the internall, &
metaphoricall sacrifices before mentioned of
good affection, desires, and holy works, are
not peculiar to any law, but were lawfull and
needfull vnder all lawes, and in all tymes, and
require no particular kind of men or ministers
to offer them, but may be offered vp by any
man or woman whatsoever: therefore do we
exclude all these from the name of the sacri-
fice, which heere is meant by our description,
and comprehendeth as yow see an externall
visible oblation, made by him or them, who
are peculiarly deputed by God to this office,
which are Priests: So as whensoever our ad-
uersaryes do slipp from this proper significa-
tion of a sacrifice to the other, eyther internall
or metaphoricall, which may be offered by all
sorts of people, and therevpon do say that all
men are Priests, they runne, as yow see, quite
from the purpose, as they do also for examples
ake, when to auoyd the necessity of externall
fastinge,

An ex-
ample
of an he-
reticall
fraude a-
bout fa-
stinge.

fastinge, they runne to the internall fastinge of the mynd, sayinge that true fastinge, is to fast from sinne, which as we deny not in that sense of spirituall fastinge; so is it notwithstandinge a plaine thift, and runninge from the purpose, and cannot stand with many places of the scripture, which must needs be vnderstood of the externall fast; as when Christ is said by the Euangelists to haue fasted 40. dayes together; and *S. Paul* affirmeth that he and his fellow Apostles fasted frequently; It cannot be vnderstood (I say) of fastinge only those tymes from sinne; for that Christ fasted alwayes from sinne without exception; and so do all good men both fast and sacrifice also, by offeringe vp good desires and pious actions to almighty God, dayly and hourely without distinction of men or tymes.

36. But this is not the proper, visible, & externall sacrifice which heere we meane, which was instituted by God, as peculiar to Christian people vnder the law of the ghospell, for an externall worshipp vnto him (besides the internall) and testification of their inward subiection, loue, and piety towards him; which sacrifice comming in place of all others that went before, both in the law of nature and of Moyses that prefigured and foresignified the same; and being but one and singular instead of them all, and their great variety, is to be esteemed so much more excellent then they all, as the law of the ghospell is more excellent then those lawes, and truth about

The excel-
lency of
the Chri-
stian and
externall
sacrifice.

shad-

shaddowes, & the sacred body of Christ God and man himselfe, to be preferred before the bodyes of beasts, byrds and other such creatures, vvhich vvere but signes and figures of this.

37. And in this sense do both scriptures, fathers, counsellors, and all holy Christian antiquity speake and treat of this most diuine, venerable and dreadfull sacrifice, wherof, as of the highest and most principall mystery and treasure, left by our Sauour in his Church, there are so many testimonyes, as before hath byn signified, that yt shall not be possible for me in this place, and with the breuity which is necessary, to alleage the least part therof; yet some few generall heads shall I touch, which the learned reader may see more dilated, by diuers Catholike wryters of our dayes, and he that hath not commodity or tyme to do that, may geue a ghesse by that which heere I shall sett downe.

38. First then, for that this holy sacrifice of the Christian Church was so principally intended by almighty God for the new law, as hath byn said, many things were sett downe by the holy Ghost in the old Testament, both prefiguringe and prophecyng the same, as first the sacrifice of the King and Priest Melchisedech in bread and wyne, Gen. 14. which all the auncient Fathers, by generall consent, do apply to the sacrifice vsed now in the Christian Church, and yt were ouerlong to alleage their particular authorities, lett. *S. Augustine*
I speake

Aug. l. 16.
de ciuit.
cap. 22.

speake for all: *Primum apparuit* (saith he) *sacrificium* (Melchisedech) *quod à Christianis nunc offertur Deo toto orbe terrarum.* The first sacrifice appeared in Melchisedech, which now is offered to God by Christians throughout all the world. And in another place: *Vident nunc tale sacrificium offerri Deo toto orbe terrarum:* Christians do see the like sacrifice (to that of Melchisedech) to be offered to God, ouer all the world. And all the other sacrifices, signes and oblations mentioned before, as prefiguringe the reall presence of Christs sacred body, and true flesh in the Sacrament, are applied by the selfe same Fathers, whome before we haue named, to the prefiguration also of this diuine sacrifice, conteyninge the selfe same thinge, which the Sacrament doth, but in a different sort, in respect of diuers ends, the one as yt is receaued by the communicants; the other as yt is offered vnto God the Father.

Lib. 1. cont.
aduers. leg.
& Prophet.
cap. 20.

39. After these prefigurations there follow the predictions of Prophetts as that of *Esay* 19. and 66. where is forteold the reiection of the Aaronicall priesthood and sacrifice, and a new promised vnder the Christians. The prophesy of *Daniell* also, where it is foretould, that in the last age of the law of grace, by the comminge of Antichrist, *inge sacrificium*, that is the dayly sacrifice shall cease. Of this (I say) is inferred by the ancient Fathers, that vntill Antichrists comminge there shalbe a perpetuall and dayly sacrifice amonge Christians; which is most of all confirmed by the prophesie of *Malachias* in these

Dan. 8. &
11.

Malach. 1.

these words: *Ad vos ò sacerdotes, &c.* To yow ò
priests, that despise my name, and do offer
vpon my Altar polluted bread, and do sacri-
fice the beasts that are blind, lame and weake,
I haue no more likinge of yow, saith the lord
of hosts, and I will not receaue at your hands
any gifts, for that from the east to the west my
name is great amonge the gentills, and they
do sacrifice vnto me in euery place, and do of-
fer vnto my name a pure oblation, for that my
name is great amonge the gentills, saith the
lord of hostes. Out of which place the Fathers
do shew first, that heere the priesthood and
sacrifice of Aaron was to be reiected, & a new
priesthood and sacrifice, accordinge to the or-
der of *Melchisedech*, erected amongst the gen-
tills, wherby ordinarily are vnderstood the
Christian people conuerted chiefly (from gen-
tility) who were to succeed in their place, and
that with such certainty, as the present tense
is put for the future, accordinge to the manner
of propheties; and the Antithesis or opposition
betweene the two sacrifices, the one reiected,
the other promised, doth make the matter
more plaine; for that as the Iewes sacrifice
could not be offered but in one place, to witt,
in the Temple of Hierusalem: so shall the
Christian sacrifice be offered vp *in omni loco*,
that is euery where without respect of places
from the east to the west. The Iewish sacri-
fices were many and of diuers sorts, but the
Christian sacrifice that should succeed in place
therof was to be but one. The Iewish sacri-

The op-
position
of the pro-
phetic of
Malachie.

fices were polluted, nor so much in respect of great quantity of beasts bloud powred out therin, and for that they offered defectuous beasts, as for the wickednesse of them that offered the same; but the Christian sacrifice was to be cleane & vnspotted, not only in respect of the vnbloudy manner, wherein yt was to be offered vnder the formes of bread and wyne, but especially for the excellency of the thinge yt selfe offered, being the most pretious body of Christ himselfe, and for that the demeritt of the offerer cannot take away the worth of the offeringe.

Circum-
stances
that proue
the sacri-
fice of the
masse to
haue byn
fore pro-
phesied.

40. These circumstances then considered, and that the heretikes heere cannot runne to their shift of inward, and inuisible sacrifices, (for that these could not be vnderstood by the Prophett as new sacrifices, that should succede to the ould, for that these were alwayes in vse with good men, duringe the tyme of the old sacrifice also, and were lawfull, yea commaunded in all tymes, to witt, to haue inward piety and deuotion, giue almes, and the like, these things I say considered, togeather with the expositions of holy Fathers, as well vpon these as vpon other places of the old Testament, there can be no probable doubt, but that this externall sacrifice of the Christian was prophesied by the holy Ghost longe before the comminge of Christ.

41. Secondly, the same is proued out of diuers places of the new Testament: And first out of S. Iohns ghospell, where as our Sauour

pro

promised in myſterious words the institution of this bleſſed ſacrifice, as before hath byn ſeene; ſo alſo did he ſignifie that this ſacrifice ſhould ſucceed in ſteed of all ſacrifices that went before. For whereas the *Samaritan* woman at the well, ſpeakinge of the ſchiſme betweene the *Iewes* & *Samaritans* about adoring in the Temple of *Ieruſalem*, and in the hill *Garizim* of *Samaria* (which word of adoringe muſt needs in that place ſignifie ſacrificinge, as yt doth alſo in other places of ſcripture, as *Gen. 22. Ad. 8.* and els where, for that the controuerſie betweene the *Iewes* and *Samaritans* was about the uſe of ſacrificing, as the higheſt externall act of adoration) our Sauour aunſwereth to her queſtion, that the houre was now come, when neyther in that hill of *Samaria*, nor in *Ieruſalem* they ſhould adore; that is to ſay, uſe any more ſacrifice, but that a new adoration in ſpirit and truth ſhould ſucceed the former; which adoration being vnderſtood of ſacrifice, as the circumſtance both of the place and matter do enforce, yt followeth that Chriſt did heere promiſe a new ſacrifice, that ſhould be ſpirituell and true: ſpirituell, both in compariſon of the bloody ſacrifice that went before, & for that the conſecration of Chriſts holy body in this ſacrifice, is made by ſpeciall worke and operation of the holy Ghoſt; true alſo and in truth it may iuſtly be ſaid to bee, for that yt is the fullfillinge of all precedent ſacrifices, and the truth of all former figures.

*Ioan. 4. &
6. Ioſeph.
lib. 10. de
Antiquitat.
Iudaic. c. 8.*

The expli-
cation of
the place
of *S. Iohn.*
ca. 4. about
Sacrifice.

Matth. 26.

Marc. 14.

Luc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

42. There ensue the places of *Saint Mathew, S. Marke, S. Luke, and S. Paul* about the institution and first celebration, of this vnbloudy sacrifice of Christ in his last supper, where yf we admitt that, which all the circumstances of the places themselues do plainly insinuate or rather inforce; the continuall exposition and tradition of the auncient Church doth teach vs, to witt, that Christ our Sauour hauinge consecrated his sacred body, did offer the same vnto his Father as a most gratefull sacrifice in his last supper; then must yt follow, that the words *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, do this in remembrance of me, implied a precept not only of receauinge and communicating the body of Christ, but to offer vp the selfe same also to God in sacrifice, after the example of Christ himselfe; which is that we call the sacrifice of the masse, & to proue that th^e Apostles vnderstood these words (I meane, *do this in remembrance of me*) so; and in this sense, not only the most ancient Fathers, as hath byn said, do testifie the same, but the ancient liturgies or ritualls also of the Apostles and their schollers, as namely of *S. Iames, S. Clemens, and S. Dionysius Areopagita*, do make the matter manifest, concerning the Apostles practise in this behalfe, to witt, that they did offer vp this Christian externall sacrifice in all places of the world, where they liued, and that from them the Church tooke the same precept and vse, accordinge to the testimony of old *Irenaeus Bishoppe & Martyr*, that liued aboue 1300. yeares

Prooue of
the sacri-
fice by
Christs
Institu-
tion.

gone,

gone, whose words are: *Eum qui ex creatura pa-*
nu est, accepit, & gratias egit, dicens; Hoc est cor-
pus meum; & calicem similiter qui est ex ea creatu-
ra qua est secundum nos suum sanguinem confessus est,
& noui testamenti nouam docuit oblationem, quam Ec-
clesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in vniuerso mundo offert
 Deo. Christ tooke that bread which was a
 creature and gaue thanks sayinge: *This is my*
body; and that cupp or wyne in like manner,
 which accordinge to vs, is of a creature, he
 confesseth to be his bloud, and heerby taught
 a new oblation of the new Testament, which
 the Church receauinge from the Apostles,
 doth offer the same to God, throughout the
 whole world.

*Iren. lib. 4.
 adu. hares.
 cap. 32.*

43. Heere now are touched all the points
 that might be doubted of by sectaryes, to wit,
 that this bread and wine being first creatures,
 are confessed by Christ, after consecration, to
 be his body and bloud: secondly that this was
 not only an institution of the Sacrament, and
 communion, but of a new oblation & sacrifice
 for the tyme of the new Testament: thirdly
 that yt was not only to be offered once and in
 one place, as Christs bloody sacrifice was
 vpon the Crosse, but throughout the whole
 world by the whole Church. And fourthly
 that this manner of oblation was taught the
 Apostles by Christ himselfe, and by them de-
 liuered to the said Church. What can be spo-
 ken more cleerly or distinctly by so ancient a
 wittnesse? neyther can heretiks heere haue
 any refuge to internall or inuisible sacrifices of

A most
 cleere
 place of
S. Irenaeus
 for the
 dayly sa-
 crifice.

the mynd, or to vnproper externall sacrifices of thankesgeuinge, almesdeeds, and the like, for that they are many, and were before also lawfull vnder the law of *Moyſes*, as often hath byn noted, & heere is ſaid to be taught a new particular and ſingular oblation of the new Teſtament, in ſteed of all the ſacrifices of the old Teſtament, vvhich *Irenaeus* confirmeth preſently in the next words after, by the prophecy of *Malachye* before mentioned ſayinge:

Iren. libid.

Malachias sic praesignificauit, &c. Malachy the Prophet did ſo foretell vs, (that this new ſacrifice and oblation of the new Teſtament, ſhould thus be instituted by Chriſt, and frequented by the Church) when he ſaid to the Iewiſh Priests, I haue no will or likinge in yow, &c.

Manifestissime significans, quoniam prior quidem populus cessauit offerre Deo; omni autem loco sacrificium offertur Deo, & hoc purum in gentibus; moſt manifeſtly ſignifyinge, that the former Iewiſh people (being reiecteſt) haue ceaſed to offer ſacrifice vnto God; but that amonge the gentills (to witt, Chriſtians conuerted of them) a pure ſacrifice is offered in euery place of the world, that is to ſay, without reſpect of any certayne place, as the Iewiſh ſacrifices were.

44. With *S. Irenaeus* Biſhop and Martyr, concurreth in the ſame age, and ſomewhat before him, *S. Iuſtinus* philoſopher and Martyr, who ſpeakinge of the ſelfe ſame thinge, and of the Iewes reprobation, and of the ſacrifice of the new Teſtament ordayned by Chriſt in place therof, writeth thus in his dialogue, intituled,

Triphobus

Triphon against the said Iewes: *A nemine Deus Iustin. in*
hostias accipit, nisi à sacerdotibus suis, &c. God doth *dial. Triph.*
 accept holts and sacrifice of none, but of his „
 Priests; wherefore he preuenting all those that „
 do offer such sacrifice vnto him in Christs „
 name, as Iesus Christ hath deliuered to be „
 made in the Eucharist of bread and wyne, & „
 are made by Christians in euery place, doth „
 testify that they are gratefull vnto him: but „
 your sacrifices (o Iewes) he doth reiect. Thus
 he. And these two testimonyes, of two so fa-
 mous Martyrs and Doctors, are sufficient for
 wittnesles of the first and next age after the
 Apostles, to declare what the said Apostles
 both taught and practised in this point of pu-
 blike sacrifice, and what the Church of that
 time vnderstood Christ himselfe to haue done
 in that behalfe, though I might adioyne other
 foure testimonyes more auncient yet then
 these; which are S.^a *Clement*, scholler to S. Pe-
 ter S.^b *Dionysius Areopagita*, scholler to S. Paul;
 S.^c *Martiall* Bishop of *Burdeaux*, and S.^d *Alexan-*
der Bishop and Martyr of Rome; All which do
 no lesse cleerly then these two, declare vnto
 vs the doctrine and practice of their tymes
 vnder the Apostles.

a l. 5. Conf.
Apost. c. 12.
et l. 8. c. 5.
et 16.
b l. de Eccl.
Hier. cap. 3.
c epist. ad
Burdegali.
cap 3.
d ep. 1. De-
cret. ad Or-
thodox.

45. But for auoydinge prolixity I must passe
 them ouer, aduertisinge only by the way, that
 where in the Acts of the Apostles yt is wryt-
 ten by S. *Luke*, cōcerning the mission of S. *Paul*,
 and *Barnaby* to preach, *Ministrantibus illis Domino*,
& ieiunantibus, dixit Spiritus Sanctus, Segregate mihi
Sanctum & Barnabam, &c. They ministring vnto
 God,

Act. 13.
 That the
 Apostles
 did sacri-
 fice.

„ God, and fastinge (to witt, *Barnabas, Symon,*
 „ *Lucius, Manahen and Saul*, that were Prophets
 „ and Doctors saith *S. Luke*) the holy Ghost said
 „ to them, take out for me *Saul*, and *Barnabas*, to
 „ the worke that I haue chosen them for. Now
 as concerning the mynistry which these men
 were performing, when the holy Ghost spake
 vnto them, the Greeke word vsed by *S. Luke*,
 importeth rather sacrificing, and so doth *Eras-*
mus translate yt, who was no euill Grecian,
 nor of small creditt with our aduersaryes: and
 of that word proceed the names before men-
 cyoned of *Liturgie*, conteyninge the order of
 this sacrifice in the Christian Church.

Liturgie-
gommien.

46. But howsoeuer this bee, yow haue
 heard the iudgement of the first age, after the
 Apostles, by two wittnesse of singular credit,
S. Iustinus, and *S. Irenaeus*: for the second may
 speake *S. Cyprian* to the same effect: *Iesus Chri-*

Cyp. lib. 2.
epist. 8.

stus Dominus & Deus noster, ipse est summus sacerdos
Dei Patris, & sacrificium Deo Patri ipse primus obtu-
lit, & hoc fieri in sui commemoratione praecepit. *Iesus*

„ *Christ* our Lord and our God, he is the high
 „ Priest of God the Father, and he offered vp
 „ first of all to God his Father a sacrifice, and
 „ commaunded this to be done in his comme-
 „ moration. Lo he commaundeth vs to sacrifice
 as he did sacrifice. And for the third age after
 the Apostles *S. Ambrose* may only speake: *Ponti-*
fex noster ille est; (saith he) qui obtulit hostiam nos
mundantem; ipsam offerimus nunc, quae tunc oblata
quidem, consumi non potest. He is our high Priest
 „ that offered the host which made vs cleane,

Ambros.
comment.
in cap. 10.
ad Hebr.

the

the selfe same do we offer now, which then was offerred, and cannot be consumed. Be-
hould that we offer the selfe same host that Christ offerred, and cannot be consumed. And for the fourth age *S. Austen* may stand for all, who answering *Faustus* the *Manichee*, that obie-
cted, that he and other Catholiks did offer sac-
rifice vnto Martyrs; the holy Father denyeth
yt sayinge: *Sacrificare martyribus dixi, &c.* I said
that we did not sacrifice vnto Martyrs, but
I said not, but that we sacrificed to God in the
memoryes of Martyrs, which we most fre-
quently vse to do, after that only rite, which
God in the manifestation of the new Testa-
ment hath comaunded vs to sacrifice vn-
to him.

47. By all which testimonyes is euident, that
the Church of God, in the first foure ages af-
ter the Apostles, did both offer an externall
sacrifice, which was the same that Christ had
offerred before, and this after a peculiar rite
insinuated by Christ to the Apostles, and de-
liuered by them to their posterity (which pe-
culiar rite is more expressed in the liturgies
before mentioned) and that all this is done by
the authority and example of Christ himselte
in his last supper, and by tradition of the
Apostles, which is inough to settle any pious
mans conscience. Now then thirdly, whereas
I should by order passe to the consideration of
ancient Fathers sayings & testimonyes about
this matter, they are so many and copious, as
I should be prolix and weary to the reader in
produ-

*Aug. l. 20.
contr. Faust.
Manich.
cap. 21.*

„
„
„
„

Divers
heads of
Fathers
authori-
ties.

1.

producing so many as may be alleaged, no one article or mystery of our faith, being so often handled or inculcated by them, as this of the Church sacrifice. For better comprehendinge wherof, I shall, as for the mystery of the *real presence* before, heere note only vnto thee certayne generall heads, whervnto the said Fathers testimonies may be reduced; as first, that euery where in their wrytings, speakinge of this oblation made in the masse, they vse the words *sacrificium, hostia, victima, offerre, immolare, sacrificare*, all which are words that peculiarly and properly do signify sacrifice; which is certayne that the said Fathers would neuer so comonly haue vsed, no more then the Protestants do vse them now of their supper, if they had meant no otherwise then the Protestants do for other Sacraments; as *Baptisme* for example they do not call eyther sacrifice, host, or victime, nor that the act of *Baptizinge*, is offeringe, immolation or sacrifice, as they do the act of celebratinge masse, wherof yow may read all the Fathers generally, as *S. Hypolytus Martyr, Orat. de Antichrist. S. Ambrose in psalm. 38. Nissen. orat. de resurrect. Chrysost. hom. 24. in 1. Cor. & hom. 17. in epist. ad Hebraeos. Cyrill. lib. de adorat. Aug. l. 2. quest. Euang. q. 8. & l. 4. de Trinit. cap. 14. 48.* The second head is of those authorities, that do compare this Christian sacrifice with the sacrifices of the Iewes, affirminge the one to be of the flesh of beasts & spotted, the other of the pure, and immaculate flesh of Christ, which they would neuer haue done in like manner,

2.

man
true
in th
Tert
Chry
Amb
Aug.
psal
49.
that
stia
out
Chr
wh
crue
and
ma
the
one
the
th
in
Am
lib.
cap
50
thi
for
ab
of
off
pr
on

manner, yf they had not meant properly of true externall sacrifices, offered by Christians in the new law, wherof yow may see at large *Tertullian lib. contr. Iudeos cap. 1. Iustin. in Triph. Chrysost. in psalm. 95. Cyprian. lib. de vnitat. Ecclesia Ambros. in cap. 1. Luca. Nazianz. orat. 2. de paschat. Aug. lib. 17. de Ciuitat. Dei cap. 20. S. Leo. serm. de passion. and many others.*

49. The third head is of those authorities, that compare this dayly sacrifice of the Christian Church, offered in euery place throughout the world, with the only sacrifice of Christ, offered once for all vpon the Crosse, wherein for differēce sake they vse the words, *cruentum & incruentum sacrificium*, that is bloody and vnbloody sacrifice, for distinguishinge the māner of the oblatiō, the one vpon the Crosse, the other vpon many Altars in the Church at once, till the worlds end, otherwise holding the thing it selfe offered to be the very same in th' one & other sacrifice. See *S. Chrysost. hom. 24. in 1. Cor. & hom. 2. ad 2. Tim. Cyprian. lib. 2. ep. 3. Ambros. in psalm. 38. Nissen. orat. 1. de resurrect. Aug. lib. 3. cont. Donatist. cap. 19. & lib. 20. contr. Faust. cap. 21. Ischius in Leuit. cap. 8. and others.*

50. The fourth head is of those, that affirme this our dayly sacrifice to be propitiatory both for the liue and dead, as well those that are absent as present, and that for both these sorts of people yt ought, and was accustomed to be offered in their dayes, which doth evidently proue yt a true sacrifice, for that a Sacrament only doth profit only those that do communicate

3.

4.

nicate and receaue the same, and no Prote-
stant will say that their communion is offered
vp for those that are absent, quicke or
dead, as the ancient Fathers do euery where
say, that our host & Eucharist was offered vp
in their dayes, and consequently they held yt
not only for a Sacrament, but also for a sacri-
fice; wherof yow may see *S. Chrysostome hom. 79.*
ad Pop. Antiochen; where he saith yt was offered
for Bilhopps and Gouvernours of the Church;
& *hom. 72. in Matth.* for sicke men, & *lib. 6. de Sa-*
cerdotio for the dead. For which effect see *S. Au-*
gustine lib. 22. de ciuit. cap. 8. & *in Enchirid. cap. 110.*
& *lib. 9. Confess. cap. 12.* where he professeth to
haue offered sacrifice of the masse for his mo-
ther *S. Monica.*

5.

51. The fifth head is of those places wherin
the Fathers do vse the words *Altar, Priests and*
Priesthood, as proper, peculiar, and appropriated
to true sacrifices; For as the Protestants of our
rymes do not vse these words, for that they
hould not their supper to be a sacrifice, but ra-
ther do fly them, though neuer so much vsed
by the said Fathers, and in place thereof do vse
the words, *table, minister, mynistry,* and other
such like of their new Religion; so neyther
would the Fathers haue vsed the same words;
yf they had had the same meaning that Prote-
stants haue; For that well knew the said Fa-
thers how to expresse their meaninge in pro-
per words, and therefore when they say that
Altars amonge Christians; are, *sedes corporis*
Christi the seats of the body of Christ, and that
in

Optat. l. 6.
sent. Paru.

in their dayes Christians did ^b *adgeniculare aris* ^b *Terent. l. de Penitent.*
Dei, knele downe at the Altars of God, & quod ^c *Ambros. l. 5. ep. 33.*
^c *obsculabantur altaria*, that they kissed the Altars, and that the office of Christian Priests is to sacrifice vpon the said Altars, yt is euident what they meant, to him that will vnderstand them, wherof more may be read in *S. Cyprian lib. 1. ep. 9. Euseb. lib. 1. demonstr. Euang. cap. 6. Athan. in vita Anton. Nazianz. orat. in Gorgon. Nissen. lib. de baptismo. Chrysost. hom. 53. ad Pop. Antioch. & hom. 20. in 2. Cor. Hieron. lib. cont. Vigilant. & dial. cont. Lucifer. Aug. lib. 8. cap. vlt. and others.*

52. The fixt consideration out of the Fathers, may be their lyturgyes or forme of diuine seruice or masse, for offeringe of this sacrifice in those dayes, of which sort of liturgyes there are extant vnto this day diuers, as that of *S. Iames the Apostle*, *S. Clement* scholler and successor of *S. Peter*, of *S. Basill*, *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Ambrose*, which albeit in all particular forme of prayer, do not agree with our forme and canon of masse at this day, yet in the substance of the sacrifice they do, as also in many other particular circumstances, vsinge the words of *oblation*, *sacrifice*, *viçtime*, *signes*, *singings*, *blesings*, *elevationes*, and other such rites which Protestants cannot abide. And for the cannon, and forme of our masse, which is vsed at this day in the Latyn Church, most parts therof are to be seene in *S. Ambrose* his books *de Sacramentis*, and the whole order as now yt is hath endured without alteration from *S. Gregory* the first downeward, wherof yow may see *Alcuinus*,

Amala-

Amalarium, VValfridus, and other ancient authors in their books de diuinis officijs.

Luther
reiekteth
all Fathers
about the
masse.

Lib. de
Missa & l.
de sacrozand,
miss. & lib.
contr. An-
glie Regem.

53. By all which generall heads, yow may easily see the multitude of testimonies; that may be alleaged out of the Fathers, yf we should prosecute euery one of these in particular; & how great reason *Martyn Luther* had to except against them all, or rather to defy them all, when first he begā to write against this sacrifice, *Hic non moramur* (saith he) *si clamitant Papista, Ecclesia, Ecclesia, Patres, Patres*; heere we care not, though Papists cry, Church, Church, Fathers, Fathers; And againe: Heere I do professe against them that vwill cry out, that I do teach against the rite of the Church and ordinances of Fathers, that I vwill heare none of these obiections. And in another place against our K. Henry of England, much more immodestly and wickedly, when the King alleaged the authorities of ancient Fathers for the masse, this shamelesse fellow answered: *Thomisticos asinos, &c.* I say that these Thomisticall asses haue nothinge to bringe forth, but only a multitude of men, and vse of antiquity. And a little after he saith expressely; that he careth not though a thousand Augustines, and a thousand Cyprians be brought against him. So as this first Father and chiefe Captayne of our Protestants, did easily graunt, as yow see, that the whole consent of ancient Fathers was against him.

Ponderations vpon the Premises.

§. 4.

34. All which being considered, there remaineth only to weigh, what a discreet man may thinke or do in this important case: For first heere is all the antiquity of the Christian Church on the one side, that testifyeth vnto vs not only what was beleueed and exercised in their dayes, but vpon what grounds also, both of scriptures of the old and new Testament, and by Christs owne institution, fact and ordination, and by the practise and tradition of the Apostles themselues. Then is there the continuance of all ages since, throughout all countreyes and nations of Christendome, as hath byn said. There is the agreement of all generall Councells: The consent of all Ecclesiasticall historyes, wherein as there is continuall mention of both publike and priuate exercise of this externall Sacrifice: So is there no memory at all, of any tyme synce the Apostles wherein yt began, or that euer any contradiction, doubt, or question was about the same, for 1200. yeares togeather after Christs assension, which must needs haue happened, yf the vse therof had not byn prescribed and left by Christ and his Apostles themselues. For what men or people would haue attempted to begin, or bring in so great a mat-

Important
considera-
tions.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

- ter as this? or who would haue receaued yt without opposition, yf yt had not byn established euen from the beginnunge? I adde also another consideration of no litle importance, which is, that yf Christ had left his Church & people without a particular externall sacrifice, wherby they should be distinguished from all other people; the Christian Church vnder the law of grace, should be inferiour to the Church of the patriarks vnder the law of nature, and vnto the Prophetts vnder the law of Moyse: for that both of those Churches and people had an externall dayly sacrifice, wherby to honour God, besides the internall sacrifice of their mynd: neyther can yt be said, that Christs owne sacrifice on the Crosse, once offered for all; is this dayly sacrifice apprehended by vs in faith, for that they also beleueed in him, and their sacrifices were acceptable only by faith in him to come. And therefore as Christs one sacrifice then to come, was no impediment, why their dayly sacrifices; which tooke their valour from this one of Christ, should not be dayly offered amonge them: so the same sacrifice of Christ vpon the Crosse, being now past, should not take away our dayly sacrifices offered in remembrance thereof, and for the applying of the infinite valour of that one sacrifice vnto vs, from which this other dayly sacrifice taketh his sufficiency.
7. 35. Furthermore the very outward forme of all Christian Churches, there buildinge with Crosses, Altar, Iles, and the like, the

foundinge of monasteries, Chappells, oratories, the ceremonies in foundinge them, their statutes for sayinge of masses for the dead, which were in Britany both before our nation was conuerted, and much more after, the whole Canon of our Latyn masse-booke which is graunted by our aduersaries, and evidently proued to haue byn, as yt is now, for aboute a thousand yeares together, and brought in by *S. Augustine* our first Apostle: All these things I say, do shew whether this were a matter to be called in question by a few libertyne Priests, and auaritious noble men, & to be banished the realme vpon a soddayne, vnder the name of a child Kinge, that knew not what yt meant, as yt was in *K. Edwards* dayes in our miserable countrey.

6. Moreouer yf yow ponder with your selfe, what manner of Priests they were for life, learninge, and verttie that acknowledged themselues to haue offered sacrifices vpon Altars in their dayes, as *S. Irenaeus*, *S. Cyprian*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Augustine*, *S. Gregory*, and others of the first ages, yea and for these later ages, since *Berengarius* mooued first the question about the *reall presence*, as *S. Anselme*, *S. Bernard*, *S. Thomas of Aquin*, *S. Dominicke*, and almost infinite other Saints, and holy men, of whome all historyes do report wonderfull extraordinary tokens, of almighty God his speciall fauours towards them; and do compare them with the first married Priests and apostata friars, that were the first impugners

The comparison of Priests that offered or impugned the sacrifice of the masse.

9.

of this sacrifice in England or round about vs, we shall find a great difference. And then yf we consider, by what good spiritt or motive *Luther* began the first contradiction in *Germany*, which was by the diuells owne perswasion and personall appearance vnto him, and disputinge against yt (for yt seemed that he esteemed so much both of the man and the matter, that he would not send an Embassadour vnto him, as he did soone after to *Zwingliu*, for impugninge the *reall presence*, but go himselfe in proper person) and that all this is confessed by themselues, and testified by their owne wrytings: All this, I say, being laid togeather, may strengthen him that hath any faith at all, to stand constant in the beleefe of the Catholike Church concerninge these articles: For yf there be any certainty or ground in Christian Religion at all, yt must needs be in these, wherein authority, learninge, antiquity, consent, continuance, vniuersality, miracles, and all other sorts of theologicall arguments, both diuine & humane, do concur, and nothings at all with the impugnors, but only selfe-will, passion, and malicious obstinacy, as yow will better see afterward, when yow come to examine their obiections.

10.

57. Furthermore yt is to be pondered, what miserable men they were that first in our dayes, against the whole army of Gods Church did presume to impugne this blessed sacrifice, vpon such simple and fond reasons before yow haue heard, to witt *Luther* in *Ger*
many

many, vpon the motiue laid downe vnto him by the diuell, in his disputation with him, recorded by himselfe in his wrytings, and *Nicolaus Ridley* in England, vpon certayne places of the scripture, and certayne testimonies of Fathers (to vse his owne words) which made nothinge at all for his purpose, as after most cleerly shall be shewed in due place, and we may easily ghesse by that, which hath byn alleaged before out of scriptures and Fathers: for that scriptures cannot be contrary to scriptures; nor are Fathers presumed to impugne Fathers, in so great a point of faith as this is.

58. Wherefore miserable & twise miserable were these men, that first vpon so small grounds aduentured to make so fatall a breach in Gods Church; and thrise miserable were other, who vpon these mens creditts, ranne to aduenture both body and soule euerlastingly, in pursuite of this breach and contradiction begunne, as were the most of *Fox* his phantasticall Martyrs of the ruder and vnlearned sort, who in all their examinations & answers, were most blasphemous in defiance and detestation of this blessed-Sacrament, as yow haue seene in their histories; and therby did well shew that they were gouerned by his spirit, that aboue all honours doth enuy this that is done to almighty God, as the highest, and most pleasing to his diuine Maiestie of all others. And so much for this point.

CERTAYNE OBSERVATIONS

*To be noted, for better aunswereinge of
hereticall Cavillations, against
these articles of the bles-
sed Sacrament.*

CHAP. III.

HAVING exhibited a taſt in the former Chapter, of the many great and ſubſtanti-
all grounds, which Catholike men haue to
ſtand vpon, in theſe high and diuine miſteryes
of Chriſts ſacred body in the Sacrament and
ſacrifice, and ſhewed in like manner that the
faithleſſe and infidious Sacramentary, that
wrangleth againſt the ſame, hath no one
plaine place indeed, eyther of ſcriptures or
Fathers for his purpoſe, but only certayne ob-
iections, founded for the moſt part vpon ſenſe
and humayne reaſon againſt faith, and aun-
ſwered ordinarily by our ſchoolemen them-
ſelues that firſt obiected the ſame, and out of
whoſe books the heretiks ſtole them; I haue
thought yt beſt for more perſpicuityes ſake, &
for helpinge their vnderſtanding, that are not
exerciſed in matters aboue ſenſe, to ſet downe
a few obſervations in this very beginninge
whereby

whereby great light will grow to the reader, for discouering whatsoeuer shall after be treated about this matter. But yet before I enter into the obseruations themselues, I would haue the reader consider two things; first the inequality betweene our aduersaries and vs in this case, for that their arguments against these mysteryes, being founded almost all in the appearance of comon sense (as hath byn said) the vnlearned reader is capable of the obiection, but not of the solution, which must be taken from matters aboue sense, as presently yow shall see.

Two things diligently to be noted.

2. The second point is, that yf any of the old heretiks, or heathen philosophers should rise againe at this day, and bringe forth their arguments of sense & humaine reason against such articles of our faith, as in ould tyme they did impugne, for both improbable and impossible in nature; as namely the creation of the world out of nothings; three distinct persons of the blessed Trinity in one, & the selfe same substance; two distinct natures in one person conioyned by the incarnation of Christ; the resurrection of our putrified bodyes, the selfe same substance, qualityes, quantityes, & other accidents, & such like points: Against which, I say, yf ould philosophers, & heretiks should come forth againe in our dayes, and propose such arguments as in their dayes they did, which seeme inuincible and vnanswerable to common sense and humaine reason; do yow not thinke that they should haue infinice

people both men and weomen to follow them, especially yf they were countenanced out with the authority of a potent Prince and Kingdome, and suffered to speake their will, as our men were, that first impugned the *real presence*, and sacrifice in England; and yet as the auncient Fathers in their tymes, did not abandone these articles of faith for those difficultyes, or appearance of impossibilityes; nor the common Catholike people themselves, that could not reach to the vnderstandinge therof; so must not we do now, though we could not aunswere in reason the aduersaries arguments, which yet by the ensuinge obseruations, yow will easily be able to do. And this for an entrance; now to the obseruations themselves.

First Obseruation.

That vve are not in this mystery to follow our sense, or Imagination. §. 1.

3. The first obseruation is taken out of the ancient Fathers wrytings, who treatinge of this mystery of Christs being in the Sacrament, do expressely warne vs to beware, that we iudge not of the matter according to sense or humayne imagination: So faith *S. Cyrill B.* of Hierusalem, whose words are: *Quamuis sensus hoc tibi suggerat, &c.* Albeit externall sense do suggest vnto thee, that this Sacrament is bread and wyne; yet lest faith confirme thee to the

*Cyrrill. Ca-
tech. 4. my-
stag. propo-
sitionum.*

17039

contrary

contrary; neyther do thou iudge by the tast, knowinge most certainly, that this bread, which seemeth so vnto vs, is not bread in deed, notwithstandinge the tast doth iudge it to be bread; but is the body of Christ; and that the wyne, which so appeareth to our sight, & by the sense of our tast, is iudged to be wyne, yet is it not wyne, but the bloud of Christ. Thus hee, neere thirteene hundred yeares gone. And the like aduertisment giueth in the same matter *S. Ambrose*, somewhat after him, who hauing determined most cleerly the truth of the *reall presence*, sayinge: *Panis iste, panis est ante verba Sacramentorum, vbi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit corpus Christi*: This bread is bread, before the words of the Sacrament be vttered (by the Priest) but when the consecration is added thervnto, the bread is made the body of Christ: He frameth an obiection of the senses in these words: *Fortè dicas, aliud video, &c.* Perhaps thou wilt say, I see another thinge (to witt bread, and not the body of Christ) and how then dost thou say that I receaue his body? To which question *S. Ambrose* aunswereth at large alleaginge many other myracles, wherein our senses are deceaued.

Ambro. l. 4. de Sacram. cap. 1.

Ambro. l. 1. de myster. inu. tiand. c. 9.

4. The like obseruation hath *S. Chrysostome* in sundry places, talkinge of this mystery: *Credamus* (saith he) *vbique Deo, nec repugnemus ei, etsi sensui & cogitationi nostra absurdum esse videatur, &c.* Let vs alwayes giue credit to God, nor let vs resist him, albeit the thing seeme absurd to our sense and cogitation, for our sense may easily

Chrysost. hom. 83. in Mark.

be

be deceaued; and therefore for so much as he
 hath said; *This is my body*, lett vs not doubt
 therof at all, but belecue him. *Saints Epiphanius*
 standeth also vpon the same aduertisment, re-
 prehendinge them greuously, yea condem-
 ninge them that dispute and frame their argu-
 ments, from the testimony of their senses a-
 gainst the *reall presence*, whose words he bring-
 geth in thus: *Et videmus* (say they) *quod non aequale*
est, &c. We do see with our eyes, that this
 which we do receaue in this Sacramēt (to witt,
 the host) is neyther equall nor like the image of
 Christ in flesh, nor to his inuisible deiry, nor
 to the formes or lineaments of his body, for yt
 is of a round forme, &c. So they; but *S. Epi-*
phanius his conclusion is against them thus: *qui*
non credit esse ipsum verum, excidit à gratia & salute;
 he that doth not belecue Christ himselfe to be
 truly there (vnder the round forme of bread that is
 giuen) is fallen both from Gods grāce, and his
 owne saluation.

Epiph. in
Ancorat.
circa me-
dium.

Epiph. ibid.

5. And finally not to enlarge my selfe fur-
 ther in this behalfe, *Eusebius Emissemus*, or who
 els was the author of that excellent sermon *de*
corpore Domini, concurrereth also in this note a-
 gainst the iudgement of our senses sayinge;
Verà vnica & perfecta hostia fide aestimanda, non specie,
non exteriori censenda visu; This only and perfect
 host is truly to be esteemed by faith, and not
 to be iudged by the externall shape or veiw of
 our eyes. Thus hee; wherof *S. Chrysostome* gi-
 ueth an example when he wryteth of this my-
 stery: *O quot modò dicunt, vellent formam, & speciem*

Eusebius
Emis. serm.
5. de Pa-
stibat.

cum,

quis, vellem vestimenta ipsa, vellem calceamenta videre. Chrysost.
hom. 51. &
83. in
Matth.

O how many are there (*videlicet* of the simpler sort, and not so grounded in faith) that say, I would I could see Christ, his forme & shape in the Sacrament, I would see his apparell, I would see his very shooes. Thus said some in those dayes, vpon simplicity perhappes; but so say many more in our dayes, vpon heresie and infidelity. And truly yf we consider most of the arguments of all Fox his artificers, or weomen Martyrs, they were such as these heere mentioned, & deryded by *S. Chrysostome*, and vpon these arguments went they to the stake: *Let your God in the Sacrament* (said Alice Driuer and her fellowes) *shedd some bloud, and vve will beleue.* The like cryed out many other simple & rude people; *vve see bread, we see wyne, vve see a round cake, we will neuer beleue yt to be God, except we see him worke some miracle.* What would *S. Chrysostome* (thinke yow) and other Fathers before mentioned haue said to these people, yf they had heard them sound out such blasphemous cryes of infidelity, and vnbeleefe in their dayes? And so much for this first obseruation, which is vsually to be found in all auncient Fathers wrytings.

The second Obseruation.

That not only sense and common Imagination, but neyther philosophicall reason is necessary to be followed in these mysteryes. §. 2.

6. The second obseruation is much like to the first, but passeth some degrees further, and is taken out of the auncient Fathers aduertisements in like manner, to witt, that not only sense, and sensuall imagination is not to be followed in these diuine mysteryes, of our Sauiours body; but neyther naturall, or philosophicall reason it selfe, is allwayes to be followed, notwithstandinge yt reacheth farre higher then sense can attayne to: which is proued first by the generall definition of faith, vsed by S. Paul in his epistle to the Hebrues, where yt is said to be *argumentum rerum non apparentium*, an argument or assent of things, that do not appeare by reason, which yet is more explicated by Saint Gregory, when he saith: *fides non habet meritum, vbi humana ratio prabet experimentum*; faith hath no meritt, where humane reason doth yeld a prooffe: Saint Augustine also saith: This is the praise of faith, yf that which is beleeued be not scene, for what great matter is it, yf that be beleued, vvhich is euident? And this is vniuersally in all points of our faith, the beleefe wherof must not depend of the euidency of reason, for then yt should be science (as philosophers tearme yt) and not faith, which faith depen-

Gregor.
hom. 16. in
euang.

Aug. tract.
79. in Ioan.

deth
giue
7.
high
Alta
racle
lesse
perfo
sostom
discer
learn
why
ther
same
cend
of th
at on
O mi
o go
sursum
nibus
Fath
by al
effe
effigie
caro:
discip
in ou
but i
wor
8.
thers
Sacr

deth on the authority, trust and creditt we
giue to the reuealer, which is God himselfe.

7. But especially is this to be done in this
high mystery of the blessed Sacrament of the
Altar, which is not only a mystery, but a mi-
racle also, and such a miracle, as requireth no
lesse power then the omnipotency of God to

performe the same: *Necessarium est* (said S. Chry-
sostome to his people of Antioch) *mysteriorum*
discere miraculum, &c. It is necessary for vs to

Chrysost. in
serm. ad
Pop. Antioch.

learne this myracle of mysteryes, what it is, ,,
why it was giuen vs, what vtility cometh ,,
therwith vnto vs & the like: And againe the
same Father in his bookes of Priesthood, de-
scending to treat more in particular one point
of this mystery, which is, how Christs body is
at one tyme in many places, he cryeth out;

O miraculum! o Dei benignitatem! O miracle!
o goodnesse of God! and why? *qui cum patre*
sursum sedet, in illo ipso temporis articulo omnium ma-
nibus peragatur, he that sitteth aboue with his

Chrysost.
l. 3. de Sa-
cerdot.

Father, in that very instant of tyme is handled
by all Priests hands: And S. Cyprian to the same
effect: *Panem quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non*
effigie sed natura mutatum, omnipotentia verbi factum est
carno: The bread which our Lord gaue to his

Cyprian. serm.
de sana
Domini.

disciples (at the last supper) being changed not
in outward shew (for yt appeareth bread still)
but in nature, by the omnipotency of Gods
word is made flesh.

8. Thus thought and spake the ancient Fa-
thers of this high mystery, and miracle in the
Sacrament. And conforme to this, they called

vs alwayes from reason to faith, from contention to humble beleefe, when they treated therof, for so wryteth among other auncient Fathers S. Hilary speakinge of this matter: *non est humano aut saculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum.*

Hilar. lib. 2.
de Trinit.

„ We must not talke of works of God accordinge to humayne and wordly reason, &c.
„ touchinge the naturall verity of Christ in vs
„ (by this Sacrament) that which we affirme
„ except we haue learned yt of himselfe, we do
„ affirme the same folishly, and impioussly, but

Roman. 6.

he hath said: *my flesh is truly meate*, &c. Vnto whome S. Ambrose agreeinge, faith of the same mystery: *Quid hic quaris natura ordinem*, &c. Why

Ambrose. l. 4.
de Sacram.
cap. 4.

seekest thou heere the order of nature (touchinge the body of Christ in the Sacrament)
„ forsomuch as our Lord Iesus was borne of
„ the Virgin beside the course of nature. Heere
yow see he compareth this mystery, and myracle of Christs being in the Sacrament, with the myracle of his incarnation & myraculous byrth, of the blessed Virgin. The very same

Ephrem. lib.
de natura
Dei. mimi-
me scrutan-
da cap. 5.

iudgement held S. Ephrem equall in antiquity to S. Ambrose. *Quid scrutari inscrutabilia*, &c. What dost thou teach after thinges vnsearcheable? Yf thou examine these thinges curiously, thou wilt seeme not to be faithfull but curious: be faithfull and simple, and so participate the immaculate body of thy Lord, beleeuinge most certaynely, that thou dost eat the very whole lambe yt selfe, &c. So he.

9. Saint Augustine also in many places doth beat earnestly, against this standing vpon rea-

son

son in matters of faith, but especially in his
epistle to *Volutianus*, sayinge: *Quæ sibi quisque fa-*
cilia, &c. The things which each man esteemeth
easy for him to conceaue, though he cannot
make them, he is content to beleue them, but
all that is aboue his capacity he holdeth for
false and feigned. And againe: *Si ratio*
queritur non erit mirabile, yf yow seeke reason
for euery thinge, yt will not be maruelous,
Demum, Deum aliquid posse quod nos fateamur inuesti-
gare non posse: Lett vs graunt that God can do
somewhat, wherof we cannot seeke out the
reason; *in talibus rebus tota ratio facti est potentia*
facientis; in such matters all the reason, that
can be alleaged for the fact, or for that which
is done, is the power of the doer. And in another
place the same Father hauinge spoken of the
blessed Sacrament and how Christ our Sau-
our is therein *sub aliena specie*, vnder another
forme of bread and wyne, as the Angells also
appeare vnto vs vnder assumed bodyes, he
concludeth thus: *Mihi autem omnino vile est, &c.* *Ibidem.*
It is very profitable for me to remember my
owne feeble forces, & to warne my brethren
that they also be myndfull of theirs, to the
end that our humayne infirmity do not passe
further (in search of these mysteryes) then is
safe for vs to do. So blessed *S. Augustine.*
And finally *S. Cyrill* Bishop of *Alexandria*
handlinge those words of the faithlesse Ca-
pharnaites, *Ioan. 6.* How can he giue his flesh to be
eaten, &c. reprehendeth greatly such curious
inquisition sayinge: *Numquam in tam sublimibus*
rebus

August. ep. ad Volutian.

Aug. ibid.

Ibidem.

Eyrill.
Alex. l. 4.
in Ioan.
2ap. 12.

rebus illud (quomodo) aut cogitemus aut proferamus. In so high matters (as these of the Sacrament) let vs neuer thinke or alleage this word (quomodo) that is, *how yt can be*? And in this manner did the ancient Fathers proceed about this mystery, by way of faith and humble submission of their iudgements and vnderstandings, and not by feeding their imagination with probability of humayne reason against faith, as the sectaries of our tyme do, yea and placing so much confidence therein, as they were content to dy for the same (as after yow will see by experience, when we come to handle their arguments in particular, wherof the greater part (yea almost all) relyed eyther vpon common sense, or some little shew of humayne reason. And thus much for the second obseruation.

Third Obseruation.

That reason is not contrary to faith, but inferior vnto it. §. 3.

11. The third obseruation may be, that though yt is iustly accounted a fault of folly, pride, heresie, or infidelity by the foresaid Fathers, to stand too much vpon sense & reason in these mysteryes, which do surpasse them both; yet are they not contrary to reason, for that one truth cannot be contrary to another, and God is the author of both lightes, the one as a lower, the other as a more high and eminent

eminent light, so as, though this lower cannot reach to discover that, which the higher doth disclose & comprehend; yet is not this extinguished or violated by the other, but rather perfected and strengthened. Reason reacheth only to things that are probable in nature, faith ascendeth to all that is possible, and not only possible to man, but euen to God himselfe, which so farre exceedeth both the power and vnderstanding of man, as *S. Paul* speaking but of one point only of our faith, which is the ioyes of heauen, saith that the hart of man could not comprize the same.

12. And yet yf we would enter into the search of what is possible to Gods power and omnipotency, the scripture in few words setteth yt downe: *Non est impossibile apud Deum* Luc. 18. *omne verbum*: there is nothinge impossible to God, which is as much to say, that all thinges are possible. And againe our Sauour speaking to his Father said: *Omnia tibi possibilia sunt*: Marc. 14. All things are to thee possible. And yf we would require examples, the creation of the heauens, and of all things both in & vnder them, will minister thousands, whervnto humayne reason cannot reach. And *S. Iohn Baptist* gaue Luc. 3. an example to the Iewes, that God of stones is able to raise vp children to *Abraham*; but this also is nothing in respect of Gods infinite and incomprehensible omnipotency, which is aboue the reach of our vnderstandinge.

13. No limitation then at all is to be layd to Gods almighty power, but that he may do

L

what

D. Tho. 1.
part. 9. 24.
art. 3.

whatsoever he please, except only one, according to diuines, which is, that the thinge do not imply contradiction in yt selfe, as that yt should be and not be at once, which is impossible, or that yt should import any imperfection or impotency in God, as to synne, or dye, which are effects rather of want of power, then of omnipotency. And in this do the more learned Protestants also agree in word with vs, sayinge, that yf yt were cleere that God would haue yt so, or had said yt, that of bread should be made his flesh, and that one substance should be turned into the other, they would graunt that he could do yt by his omnipotency. Thus they say in words, to auoid the odious note of infidelity, or limiting Gods power; but when they come to the point indeed, they found all their greatest arguments vpon the impossibility thereof, as though God could not do yt. And so shall yow see afterwards, when we come to discussse their strongest arguments. And their great Grand-father Iohn VVikliffe, or rather VVicked-beleefe, as VValsingham calleth him, did absolutely deny that God was able to do yt, as Thomas VValden testifieth out of his owne wrytings. Aud Iohn Caluyn his scholler in this point calleth vs madd-men, for that we beleue that God was able to make bread his flesh in the Sacrament, and yet not to haue the externall forme, nature and propriety of flesh: *Insane* (saith he) *quid à Dei potentia postulas, vt carnem faciat simul esse, & non esse carnem?* Thou madd-

VValdens.
rom. 1. cap.
71. & 73.

Calu. lib. 4.
Institus. cap.
17. §. 24.

madd-man how dost thou demaund of the power of God, that he should make flesh to be flesh, and not flesh at one tyme? But how doth Caluyn proue (thinke yow) that our beleeve of the Sacrament implyeth this contradiction of flesh and no flesh? Forsooth (to vse his words) for that we graunt, *that God can make, that the selfe-same flesh of Christ can occupy diuers places at once, and that yt be conteyned in no certaine place, and that yt lacketh both the outward shape of flesh and proper manner of being, &c.* And for beleeuinge of this he counterth vs madd-men, as yow haue heard, and so must he account also of necessity all those holy Fathers before mentioned, who beleeued the same mystery, as we do, notwithstandinge the outward appearances of impossibility, for comprehendinge wherof they fledd from sense and reason to faith and beleeve.

Calu. ibid.

4. And yet further then this the reader must vnderstand, that for so much as the said reason and faith, are not contradictory the one to the other, but more eminent the one aboue the other, as before hath byn shewed, Catholiks do take vpon them to proue, that no one of these difficultyes obiected by faithlesse Protestants, is impossible, or implieth contradiction in reason it selfe, as by the ensuing considerations shall more particularly be declared; nothinge only to the reader by the way, that yf the particular intrinsecall natures and essences of euery thing were cleerly knowen vnto vs, as they are for example vnto Angells, and

other Saints, that be in glory, we should easily see what doth imply contradiction to the said natures, and what doth not, but for that God, for our humility and greater meritt, would haue vs not alwayes to see this; therefore are we forced to ghesse at the same by way of discourse and reason, and by one example to another, as yow shall see in the ensuing obseruations.

Fourth Obseruation.

How a body may be without an ordinary naturall place. §. 4.



Three
wayes or
manners
of being
in place.

1.

15. One of the greatest difficultyes therfore objected by the aduersary, is, that a true and naturall organicall body, such as Christs is confessed to be in the Sacrament, cannot be without the ordinary dimensions of a peculiar place, which we deny in such sense, as heere we shall declare. For better vnderstanding wherof is to be noted, that three wayes a thinge may be in a place, first naturally and ordinarily by extension and commensuration vnto the said place, soe as euery part and part cell of the thinge placed, do aunswere to each part of the place yt selfe, which manner of being in place, philosophers do call *circumscrip-
tively*, for that all places of the body so placed are so limited and circumscribed by the part of the place, as neyther that body can be in any other place, nor that place admitt and

ther body, without penetratinge the one of the other, which by ordinary course of nature is held for impossible.

16. Another manner of being in place is more spirituall, and hard to conceaue, to witt, when a thing is so in a place, as the parts thereof are not extended to the parts of the place, as in the former example, but yet that the whole thing is so defined and limited within the compasse of that whole place assigned therunto, as naturally yt cannot be in any other, whilst yt is there, as for example, the soule of a man in the body therunto assigned, is so conteyned therein, as yt is not elsewhere, and yet is it not so extended by commensuration, as in the former example, that one part of the soule aunswereth one part of the body, and another, another part, but the whole soule which is indiuisible, and hath no parts at all, is wholly in the whole body, and wholly in euery part and parcell thereof, which is a miraculous strange being, yf yt be well considered, & notwithstanding naturall as all philosophers do graunt, for that the whole soule of man is as wholly (for example) in the finger and foote, as in the breast and head, and yet is but one soule in all, and nether many soules nor one soule diuided into parts. And after the same manner, is an Angell also in a place definitiuely, and not circumscriptiuely, that is to say wholly in the whole place, which he occupieth, & wholly in euery part thereof, without multiplication or diuision in himselfe, or ex-

2.

ension vnto the parts of the place wherein yt is. But for that the example of the soule, is more familiar and euident to our sense and reason, it doth better expresse the matter. And yt is to be noted, that yt doth somewhat imitate the being of God himselfe wholly, and without diuision in all parts of the world, and in all creatures therof without limitation, change, or multiplication, but only yt differeth in this, that the soule, or an Angell, being both creatures, cannot be euery where, as the creatour naturally is, and he cannot be otherwise; but yet by his diuine power, the said creatures may be in diuers places at once, as after shalbe shewed.

17. These two wayes then of being in a place, as I haue said, are naturall; the first circumscriptiuely, the second definitiuely. But besides these two, there is a third supernaturall, and possible to Gods diuine omnipotency, and not repugnant to reason yt selfe, as after shalbe shewed; which is, that one and the selfe-same thing, may by Gods diuine power, be placed in two different places at once, that is to say, that the selfe-same soule, as yt is naturally, wholly, and entyrelly in the head, for example, and in the foote; so yt repugneth not to the same nature or essence of the soule, to be putt in two different bodyes at once. The like of an Angell in diuers places, and the same also may be held of a naturall body, if God will haue yt so, as in the next obseruation shalbe proued. And this way or manner

of being
doth h
our in
sacram
true b
the w
Father
but for
ner, as
is also
18. N
of being
we she
and no
true b
place,
scriptio
may, b
second
Sacram
mensur
first he
the sec
ensuin
19. T
cted by
pugne
ganical
such as
definit
that yt
quantit
this gre

of being in place, for that the Cath. Church doth hold yt so be in the body of our Saviour in the Sacrament, is called by diuines a sacramentall being in place, nor for that the true body is not really there, as some hearinge the word *Sacramentally*, vsed sometymes by the Fathers and Doctores, do fondly apprehend, but for that it is there after this speciall manner, as we haue declared, that is to say, so as yt is also in other places at the same tyme.

18. Now then, these three wayes or manners of being in place declared, yt remayneth, that we shew how yt is possible to Gods power, and not repugnant to naturall reason, that a true body, which of his owne nature is in place, only after the first manner of circumscription and commensuration, or extension, may, by Gods power, be in place also after the second and third way, that is definitiuely and Sacramentally, without the first way of commensuration and extension to a place. And first heere we shall shew the said possibility in the second way, and then of the third in the ensuinge obseruation.

19. The only cheefe ground, or reason objected by the heretiks, why it may seeme to repugne or imply contradiction, that a true organically body togeather with his quantity, such as Christs is in the Sacrament, should be definitiuely without extension in place, is, for that yt appeareth contrary to the nature of quantity to be without such extension; but this ground Cath. Philosophers and diuines

How a body may be definitiuely in place.

do easily ouerthrow, shewing that three things do agree to quantity or magnitude, wherof the first is to be extended in yt selfe, and to haue distinct partes one from the other among themselues, though not euer visible, or perceptible by our sense; and this first point is so essentiall to quantity and magnitude, as yt cannot be imagined separable, so as it remaine quantity. And therefore this is graunted to be in the body of our Saviour in the Sacrament, though our sense doth not comprehend yt. The second property of quantity or magnitude, proceedinge from this first, is; not only to haue partes distinct in themselues, but to haue them extended also in place, accordinge to the commensuration therof, as in the first way of being in place we haue declared.

20. And for that this second condition, or propriety, is later then the former, & ensueth therof, yt is not so intrinsecall to the nature & essence of quantity, but that by Gods diuine power yt may be separated, without destroyinge the said nature, which our diuines do shew by examples of other thinges, where God hath separated such secondary proprieties, without dissoluinge the natures, as heatinge, for example, from fyre in the fornace of Babylon, which heatinge notwithstandinge is as naturall to fyre, as yt is to quantity to occupy place. Christ also in *S. Mathewes* ghospell, hauinge said to his disciples, that yt was easier for a Camell to passe through the eye of a needle, then for a rich-man to enter into the

Cap. 19.

King

Kingedome of heauen, and the Apostles wondringe therat, and sayinge: *vyho then can be saued?* our Sauour answered, that, *that vyhich was impossible to men, was possible to God*, which yet could not be possible, but by separatinge from the camell all his naturall extension, and commensuration of place. Wherefore all the auncient Fathers vpon this place attributing this to myracle, doe affirme, that by Gods diuine power yt may be done, to witt, that a camell remayninge in the nature of a camell, may passe through a needles eye: *quid prohibet* (saith S. Gregory Nazianzen) *quo minus hoc fiat, si voluntas ita tulerit?* What letteth but that this (of the camell) may be done, yf Gods will be to haue yt so? Some Protestant will stepp forth, and say that yt cannot be done, for that the Camell should not in that case haue quantity and be organicall (for so they say of our Sauours body in the Sacrament), but Nazianzen was of another opinion: And so may yow read Origen, S. Hierome, S. Augustine, S. Hilary, S. Chrysostome, and other Fathers in their commentaries, and expositions vpon this place of S. Mathewes ghospell.

Nazianz.
oras. 36.
qua est
quarta de
Theolog.

Matth. 19.
Luc. 18.
Marc. 10.

21. The third naturall condition or propriety of quantity (proceedinge of this second) is, that for so much as by the forsaide second propriety, the thinge placed doth fill vp the place which yt occupyeth, euery part therof answeringe to euery part of the said place only, and one place conteyne one body; so as naturally yt is no lesse impossible for two bodyes to be

The third
condition
or propriety
of
quantity.

in one place, then for one body to be in many. Yet notwithstanding supernaturally, and by Gods omnipotent power, both the one & the other may be without implication, or contradiction of the essence, or nature of a true body. The reason wherof is this: for that this third propriety in quantiry or magnitude, flowinge of the second, as hath byn said, may much more easily be separated from the essence of the said quantity and body, then the second, and consequently the former being separable, this is much more, wherof our diuines do giue diuers most euident instances, out of scripture yt selfe. As for example out of S. Iohns Ghospell, where twise yt is said, that he came in to his disciples, when the gates were shut. And in *S. Mathew*, and *S. Marke*, where yt is shewed, how Christ after his resurrection came forth of the sepulcher, the stone also being shut; and in his natiuity he came forth of his mothers wombe, without violation of her virginity, and in his assension he passed through all the heauens with his naturall body. In all which myraculouse examples (for so do the ancient Fathers hould and affirme them to be) there must needs be penetration of bodyes, or two bodyes in one place, which is no lesse repugnant to the ordinary nature of quantity (as hath byn said) then for a body to be without certaine dimension of any place.

22. Besides this our diuines do alleage the examples of the damned spirits, miraculously
ryed

Iohn. 10.

Math. 28.
Marke. 16.

Ephes. 4.

Se *S. Aug.*
ep. 1. ad Vol-
us. & l. 22.
de Ciuit. Dei
cap. 8. &
Chrysost.
Euthym Cy-
rill. &c. In
commenta-
rijs.

ryed
whic
soule
men
treat
deince
natu
pora
to be
out h
perc
reaso
thes
contr
iect
wh
sequ
gram
true
23.
who
brou
see, a
ded
body
out
one
hath
shall

tyed to certayne locall places in hell; and that which is more maruelous, that the damned soules being spiritts, should suffer, and be tormented by corporall fire, wherof *S. Augustine* treateth at large *lib. 21. de Ciu. Dei cap. 1. 2. & deinceps*, which is no lesse against the ordinary nature and propriety of spiritts, to suffer corporally, then yt is against the nature of a body, to be after a certayne spirituall manner without his locall dimension; by all which we may perceauē, that although yt be aboue naturall reason, that organically bodies should want these externall locall positions; yet is yt not contrary, or contradictory therunto, but subiect to Gods omnipotent power, when, and where yt pleaseth him to make yt so, and consequently yt may be so also in the blessed Sacrament, without destroyinge the nature of a true body, as fondly Protestants do pretend.

23. And heerby now falleth to the ground, a whole mayne multitude of vayne arguments, brought by Fox his Martyrs, as after yow shall see, against the reall presence, all of them founded vpon this ground, that a true organically body cannot, by Gods power, be either without locall dimensions, or in moe places then one at once. The first of which two assertions hath now ben improued, and the second shalbe in the next ensuinge obseruation.

The fifth Observation.

How a body may be in diuers places at once. §. 5.

24. As the weake faith and learninge of the Sacramentaryes of our tyme, cannot reach to conceaue, that a body can be without an externall place; so much lesse, can they comprehend, that yt may be by Gods omnipotency placed in diuers places at once, for that yt seemeth to their sense, and humayne reason to be impossible; but the ancient holy Fathers, more wise and learned then our said Sectaryes, tooke another course in this point, which was to ascribe yt to miracle, and to Gods infinite power, which they could not by reason arriue vnto: I might cyte diuers Fathers, but one or two shall serue for all; *O miracle!* (saith S. Chrysostome) *o goodnes of God!* that the same Christ who sitteth in heauen vvith his Father, is conuersant at the selfe-same tyme, in the hands of all that receaue him on earth! And the same Father, wrytinge of the same sacred body of our Sauour, as yt is a sacrifice, saith: *Vnum est hoc sacrificium, &c.* This sacrifice is but one, for that otherwise, because yt is offered in many places, there should be many Christs, vvhich is not so, but one, and the selfe-same Christ is in euery place, (when yt is offered) here yt is whole Christ, and there it is whole Christ, and yet but one body: for as euery-where one body, and not many bodies are offered, so is there also but one sacrifice, &c.

Chrysost.
lib. 3. de
Sacerdotio.

Chrysost.
hom. 17.
in ep. ad
hebr.

In

In which places you see S. Chrysostome to hould
& to affirme, that Christs true body, without
diuision or multiplication, is offered vp in ma-
ny places at once, yea innumerable places, yf
we beleeuē S. Gregory Nissen whose words are:
As Christs diuinity doth replenish the world, and yet is
but one; so is his body consecrated in innumerable places,
and yet is but one body. So he. And do yow ob-
serue, that the Father saith not, that Christs
body is euery where, as his diuinity is, as the
Lutherane Vbiquitaries of Germany, do ab-
surdly affirme; but that yt is in innumerable
places by consecration.

*Nissen. orat.
de Paschate.*

25. Well then these Fathers denied not the
reall presence, as our Sacramentaries do, for that
they conceaued not the reason, how one body
might be in diuers places at once, but moun-
ted by faith aboue reason, ascribing the same
to miracle and Gods omnipotency, as yow
haue heard: and so do Catholiks at this day.
Heare the pious speech of a great learned man
about 400. yeares gone. *Yow vvill say to me*
(quoeth he), *how can one and the selfesame body, be*
at one tyme in diuers places, &c. Do not maruayle, he
that made the place, made the body, and the place for
the body, and the body in the place; and vvhen he ordai-
ned that one body should be in one place, yt was as plea-
sed him, and yf he would, he could haue made yt other-
vvise, &c. Thou hast seene only that vvhich he hath
made, and not that vvhich he can make, and heerevpon
doſt maruayle when thou seest any other thinge, then
that vvhich thou art accustomed to see; but do thou
thinke vpon the matter, and yt will cease to be maruay-
lous,

*Hugo de Sa
Victor. l. 2.
de Sacram.
p. 3. cap. 11.*

low, or at leastwayes, yt will not seeme to be incredible.
Thus he.

Two dif-
ficultyes
solved.

26. But our diuines do go yet further, shewing that this is not impossible, euen in nature yt selfe, for God to performe, as yow may perceauē by that we haue declared in the former obseruation: For yf yt were repugnant and contradictory to the nature of a true body, to be in diuers places at once, this must be eyther in respect of the vnity therof, for that yt should therby be diuided from yt selfe, or multiplyed in yt selfe, and so not be one but many bodies; or els secondly yt should be impossible to be in diuers places, in respect of the quantity, which a true body hath, wherby yt should be limyted to some certayne space or place; but neyther of these two difficultyes do impossibilitate the matter, as now we shall declare.

The first
difficulty
about
vnity.

Aug. ep. 3.
ad Volus.

27. Not the first about vnity, for that God being a substance indiuisible, is euery where wholly, and in euery one of his creatures, and yet remayneth one still, nor can be diuided or multiplyed: which is so wonderfull a consideration, as *S. Augustine* saith therof: *Miratur hoc mens humana, & quia non capit, fortasse non credit.* Mans mynd doth wonder at this, and for that yt conceaueth yt not, perhaps yt doth not beleue yt. Some likenesse also of this admirable being is in an Angell, which though it cannot be euery where at once, as God is, yet hath yt a wonderfull being in place; notwithstanding, as before hath byn touched, being placed within

within any compasse or circuite, as for example in a house or Church, yt is wholly in all that space, and wholly in euery part therof, & yet remayneth one and simple without diuision in himselfe: which example is more euident also in our soule, as before we haue declared, for that the selfe-same soule in a body, when yt is an infant, and when yt is at his full growth, is wholly in the whole body, & wholly in euery part therof, and yet is yt not multiplied therby, nor diuided. Whereby is made manifest, that yt repugneth not to the essence or vnity of any one substance, to be in diuers places at once, and this naturally, but much more supernaturallie, by the omnipotent power of God.

28. There remayneth then the second difficulty about quantity, or a body indued with quantity, how yt is not letted therby to be in two places at once, wherof we haue treated in the former obseruation, shewing how actuall locality by circumscription, being but a secondary propriety, following and flowing from the nature of quantity, may, by Gods power, be separated from the same, so as the said quantity may remayne with her true essence, of hauinge distinct parts in yt selfe, and yet no extensue location, or commensuration of place, in which case yt repugneth no more for the selfe-same quantity to be in many places at once, then yt doth vnto a spirituall substance without quantity, such as is an Angell, or the soule of man, and consequently the

The second
difficulty
about
quantity,

the substance of Christs body, together with the quantity in this manner, may by Gods power be put in many places at once, as we see by course of nature it selfe, that the substance of mans soule without quantity, is put in many particular places of a mans body, without diuision or multiplication, remaininge still but one only soule, as hath byn declared. And this shall suffice for explication of this possibility, how yt doth not imply contradiction, and therefore is not impossible to God.

Diuers articles beleueed by Protestants are more hard then this.

29. Neyther do our diuines shew only, that this is not impossible in our Sauours body, but further also, that we do beleue diuers other mysteryes of our faith as hard or harder then this, yea much more impossible to sense and reason, yf we consider well the difficultyes therof, as the creation of the world of nothings, the mystery of the blessed Trinity, the beleefe of Christs incarnation, our resurrection, and the like, for yt is much harder by humayne reason and naturall philosophy, to conceaue how the world could be created of nothings, and how one and the selfe-same nature can be wholly in three reall distinct persons, without diuision or multiplication in yt selfe, and how one person can be in two diuers distinct natures, as yt is in our Sauour, and how one, and the selfe-same thing being perished and corrupted, may be raised againe with the selfe-same accidents that perished before. These points I say, and diuers others which

which both we and Protestants do confesse to be true, are more harde, and impossible in naturall reason, then yt is to be beleue that one body is in diuers places at once.

30. Furthermore there be certayne familiar examples in nature yt selfe, that do resemble somewhat the matter, and may induce a man that is not obstinate, and hath any meane capacity to conceaue somewhat of the possibility therof, as when a great lookinge-glasse that represented but one face vnto yow when yt was whole, being broken into many parts euery part will represent wholly the selfe-same face. The voyce also of him, that speaketh to a great multitude, though yt be but one in yt selfe, yet cometh yt wholly to euery mans eares, which *S. Augustine* alleaged for a wonderfull thinge towards the prouinge of Gods being wholly euery-where: *Omne quod sonat* (saith he) *& omnibus totum est, & singulis totum est.* All that soundeth is heard wholly of all, and wholly of euery particular man. And though these examples be not like in euery respect, yet may they serue for a certayne induction to make vs comprehend the other; wherof we now speake.

31. Last of all, Catholike diuines do not only shew the possibility of this point, that our Satiours body may be in diuers places at once, as also that sundry other mystetyes of our faith are beleueed, of more difficulty then this, yf we regard common sense and reason, but do shew also out of the Scriptures themselues, that

Naturall examples inducing vs to this manner of being of Christs body in diuers places,

Aug. ep. 53 ad Volus.

Examples of the being of Christs body in diuers places at once.

Alt. 9. &
22.

Egesipp. l. 3.
de excidio
Hierosol.
Ambros.
erat. cont.
Ausentium
Asban. in
vita Anton.
Greg. lib. 4.
dial. c. 16.
Paul. ep. ad
Macarium.
Ioan. Diac.
l. 2. de vita
Greg. c. 22.

Mars. 16.

How
Christ is
in heauen
and in the
Sacramēt
after a dif-
ferent
manner.

Christ after his assention hath byn in more then one place at once, as is manifest by that famous apparition of his to *S. Paul*, recorded in the acts of the Apostles, when he appeared vnto him in the way neere to *Damasco*, inuiro-
ned with a great light, and talked with him in such sort, as both the light and words were seene and heard by his companions, and many other apparitions to *S. Peter* himselfe, testified by *Egesippus*, and *S. Ambrose*; to *S. Anthony* also testified by *S. Gregory*, & besides diuers others recorded by *S. Paulinus*, *Ioannes Diaconus*, and other authentick wryters, from whome, except we will derogate all credit and authority, we may not doubt, but that Christ remaininge still in heauen (for so should both we and Protestants together, that he departed not from thence) appeared also in diuers places of the earth to his Saints, and consequently his body could be in diuers places at once, wherby is broken and dissolued another squadron of arguments, framed by the Sacramentaries of our dayes to the simple people; as though Christs reall body could not be in the Sacrament, for that yt is in heauen; whereas we affirme, that both may be and stand together, though in different manner, for that in heauen he is *circumscriptiue*ly, and in the Sacrament *sacramentally*, which tearmes we haue before declared.

¶

The sixth Obseruation.

How Christes body in the Sacrament, may be now vnder a greater forme, now vnder a lesse, and the least, that may be discerned. §. 6.

32. By this also which is said may be conceived, how the sacred body of our Sauour, in the Sacramēt vnder the accidents of bread, is sometymes in a greater visible quantity, and sometymes in a lesse, accordinge to the externall formes and accidents vnder which yt is, yea and in the least part & parcell of the consecrated host, that is perceptible to our sense, for that the said body being remoued by Gods omnipotent power from all locall extension, it may be vnder a greater or smaller externall quantity, without alteration of the body yt selfe, as we see in the soule of man, which is the selfe-same in the least part of the body wherein it is, as in the greatest, or in the whole body, yea when the said body is changed, or groweth from a lesser to a greater quantity, as in an infant, who after cometh to be a great man, the selfe-same soule replenisheth the one and the other without growth or diminution in yt selfe, and so the body of Christ in a great host or a little, or in any least part thereof, when yt is broken, is wholly, and the selfe-same body, with the selfe-same internall organickall quantity, which yt had vnder a great host. And this point that the quantity of a

Note this
example.

180 *A review of ten publike*
substance may be increased or diminished ex-
ternally, in respect of place, without alteration
of the inward quantity, or substance, is evident
by many examples, which we see dayly of ra-
refaction and condensation. As for example
when a gallon of water is put in a great vessell
ouer the fire, yt cometh by boylinge to fill the
whole vessell, that is capable of many gallons,
and yet as the inward substance is not increa-
sed, so neyther the quantity in yt selfe; and
contrary wise, when the said water is againe
cooled, it returneth to occupy as small a place,
as yt did at the beginninge, and yet retayneth
allwayes the selfe same both quantity and
substance.

33. By which example, & many other that
may be alleaged, some kind of notice may be
gathered vnto our common sense and reason,
how the substance of Christs body in the Sa-
crament, togeather with his internall quan-
tity, may by his omnipotent power, be some-
tymes vnder a great externall quantity, or ex-
tension in place, & sometymes vnder a lesser;
yea the least, that by our senses may be percea-
ued: and yet is Christs body wholly and enti-
rely there, accordinge (in some proportion) to
the lookinge-glasse before mentioned, which
being broken into diuers small peeces, each
one representeth the whole visage seuerally,
which before was exhibited by the whole.
And so, when any consecrated host is broken
into many parts, that which was cōteyned be-
fore in the whole host, is now cōteyned who-
ly

How.

34.

the a
that
with
crati
brea
cram
gue,

ly vnder euery particular parcell thereof, as yt was also before. And to this effect, are those words of S. Epiphanius before alleaged, against them that said: *Videmus quod est equale, &c.* We see that the host receaued in the Sacrament, is not equall or like to the figure of Christs body, but is round, &c. Wherefore all the arguments of Fox his Martyrs, that were founded on this impropotion of the host to Christs naturall, and externall quantity, haue no ground at all, but a little fraudulent shew and appearance of sensible improbability, and yet were many of their cheefest arguments builded on this only foundation, as yow haue seene readinge ouer their historyes before recyted, and shall do more afterward, when we come to examine their arguments severally, and in the meane space this shall suffice for an aduertisment about this obseruation.

The seauenth Obseruation.

How accidents may be without a subiect, and of their operations in that case. §. 7.

34. The seauenth obseruation may be, about the accidents or formes of bread and wyne, that do remayne by Gods omnipotent power without a subiect, after the words of consecration, as they did before in the substance of bread, whervpon the more simple sort of Sacramentaryes following sence, will needs argue, that the substance also of bread & wyne,

*Aristot. 5.
Metaph.
text. 25.*

do remayne after the said consecration; and those that be more learned, do go about to proue the same by philosophicall reason, for that the nature of an accident is to be in another, as the nature of a substance is to be in yt selfe, wherof ensueth, that for so much as no accident can be in God, as in a subiect, (neither are they in Christs body, as we also doe confesse) they must needs be heere in their proper subiect and substances of bread and wyne: but all this is founded vpon a false ground, for albeit naturally an accident cannot be but in a subiect, yet supernaturally, and by the power of God susteyninge yt, and supplyinge the place of a naturall subiect, yt may be, as we do confesse on the contrary side by Christian faith, that the humayne nature of Christ in the mystery of the incarnation, hath not her proper subsistence in yt selfe (which yet is as naturall to a substance to subsist in yt selfe, as yt is to an accident to be susteyned by another) but is susteyned by the diuine person of Christ.

35. And the reason of this, concerninge accidents, is, that albeit the intrinsecall nature of an accident is to be vnperfect, and to depend of another, and therby to haue an aptitude to be in another, yet the act therof may be separated by Gods power, from the said nature, as a thinge posterior, and followinge from the said nature, as we haue shewed before in the naturall propriety of quantity, to haue commensuration of place; and this to be, true that
this

that this actuall inherence of accidents, may be severed from the essentiall aptitude thereunto, without destroying the nature of the said accident, many philosophers both Christian and heathen do affirme, whose sentences you may see gathered by diuers learned men, as well of ancient as of our tymes. Sundry Fathers also are of opinion, that this case happened *de facto* in the creation of the world, when the light being made vpon the first day, as the booke of *Genesis* recounteth, which being but a quality and accident, remayned without a subiect vnto the fourth day, when the sonne and moone weare created. And of this opinion expressly was *S. Basill*, in his explication of the works of God in those six dayes. And the same holdeth *S. Iohn Damascene*, *Procopius* in his commentary vpon the first Chapter of *Genesis*, and *Saint Iustine* in the explication of our faith.

36. This then being so, that these accidents of bread & wyne may remaine, by the power of God, in the Sacrament, without their proper subiects, yt followeth to consider, what actions they can haue: And first yt is to be noted, that whatsoever actions, or operations are proper to them, as accidents, when they were in their proper subiects of bread and wyne, before consecration, the same they may haue afterwards, when they conteyne the body and bloud of Christ, without inherence therein, for that God supplyeth all by his power, which their said subiects or substances

See *Auer.*
in epitom.
Metaphys.
tract. 2.
Aristot.
l. font. vita
tract. 2.
VValdenfis
tom. 2.
cap. 76.

Basil. ho. 2.
et 6. de
oper. sac
dierum *Damascen.* l. 2.
cap. 7.

Of the
actiuiety of
accidents
being se-
parated
from their
substance.

did performe, when they were present. So as the effects, for example, that the accidents of wine & bread did worke in our senses before, by mouinge our sight by their colours to see, our tast by their savour, and other like effects: the same do they performe also afterwards: So as, for example sake, by drinkeinge much consecrated wyne, though there be no substance of wyne therin, but only the proper accidents of wyne, as heat, smell, and other qualities and proprieties of wyne; may a man be incensed, or distempered, as much as yf the substance of wyne were there in deed, for these are the proper actions and operations of the said accidents themselves; but where the concurrence of substance is necessary to any action, as in nutrition, generation, or corruption of one substance into another, there doth God supply the matter, that is necessary to that action, when the body of Christ doth cease to be there, which is, when those accidents of bread and wyne are corrupted and not otherwise: As for example, in the resurrection of our bodyes, where euery body is to receaue his owne proper flesh againe, which yt had in this life, yf some one body hauinge eaten another body, or parcell therof in this world, and conuerted the same into his proper substance; in this case (I say) almighty God must needs supply otherwise, by his omnipotent power, that part and matter of substance, that wanteth in one of these two bodyes, for that els one of them should be vnperfect, and want

part

part of his substance in the resurrection. And after the like manner we say, that when a consecrated host is eaten, and afterward is turned into the naturall nourishment of the eater, which nourishment requireth a materiall substance, God doth supply that substance in that instant, when the formes of bread and wyne perishinge, the body of Christ ceaseth to be there.

37. And this appertayneth to the providence of almighty God, for supplying the defects of particular naturall causes, when any thinge fayleth, that is necessary for their naturall operations. The very same also is to be observed in generation, and corruption, as for example, when the accidents of the consecrated host perishinge, and some other substance should happen to be engendred thereof, as wormes, or the like, there the body of Christ ceaseth to be, when the said accidents do perish, and for the new generation insuinge thereof, God supplyeth fitt matter, as in the example before alleaged of the resurrection of our bodies, wherof the one had eaten part of the other. By which observation yt wilbe easy afterward to dissolue many cavillations, proceedinge eyther of ignorance, heresie, or both, and objected by Sacramentaryes against this mystery.

The eight Obseruation.

About the wordes Sacrament, signe, figure, type, commemoration, memory, &c. §. 8.

38. For so much as the Sacramentaries of our tyme, did forsee that they should be forced to oppose themselues, for defending their hereticall noueltye, sagainst the whole streame of scriptures, expositors, fathers, councells, reasons, practise, antiquity, and vniforme consent of the vuhole Christian vvorlde, they thought best to diuise certayne tearmes and distinctions, which should serue them for euasions or gappes to runne out at, when-soeuer they should be pressed by our arguments: and these their shifts do consist principally, in the fraudulent vse of these tearmes of *Sacrament, signe, figure, type, commemoration, memory, sacramentally, spiritually* and the like. Wherefore we thinke yt needfull to explaine and declare in this place, the natures, vses and abuses of these words.

The vword
Sacramēt
explica-
ted.

39. First then a Sacrament, according to the common definition ascribed to *S. Augustine*, is *a visible signe of an inuisible grace*, as in baptisme, the externall washinge by water, is the signe of the internall washing of the soule by grace: So heere also in this Sacrament of the Eucharist, the externall & visible signe are the consecrated formes of bread and wyne, as they coneyne the body of Christ; the internall or

inui-

inuisible grace signified, is the inward nourishinge and feedinge of our soule: And this is the first and cheefe manner how this Sacrament is a *signe*, that is to say a *signe of grace*, and not of Christs body absent, as Protestants are wont most fondly and fraudulently to inferre.

40. Secondly these externall formes and accidents of bread and wyne, are also a signe of Christs body conteyned vnder them. And in this sense is the Eucharist called sometymes by the Fathers, the *signe of Christs body*, but of Christs body present, as hath byn said, and not absent. Thirdly this Sacrament is a signe of Christ his death and passion, and of the vnion of his mysticall body the Church with him: For that as bread and wyne represented by these formes, are made of many grains and many grapes; so is Christs mysticall body, consistinge of many members vnited to him; so as by all these wayes may this Sacrament be called a *signe*, to witt, a signe of the inward grace, and nourishment of the soule obtrayned therby, a signe of Christs true body present, a signe of Christ his death, and mysticall body, and yet do none of all these figures exclude the true reall being of his body in the Sacrament, but do rather suppose the same.

41. And the like may be said to the other words, or tearmes of *figure*, *type*, *commemoration*, or *memory*, all which, when they occurre, are to be vnderstood in some of these senses, without prejudice of the reality, or truth of our Sauours being in this Sacrament, as for example,

The other words of
type figure
&c. explained.

this

this Sacrament is a *forme, type, commemoration* & memory of Christs death on the Crosse, and yet this excludeth not his *reall-presence* from hence. As for example, if a Prince hauing gayed in proper person a great & singular victory, should institute a sollemne triumph, to be made euery yeare in memory therof, & some times should go in that triumph himselfe also, yt might be truly said, that this triumph is a figure, type, commemoration, and memory of the other victory, & of the Prince, yet is the Prince truly also in yt himselfe, and so may be said in like manner of this matter of the Sacrament, wherein Christ in differēt manner, is a figure or type of himselfe. And the like may be said of the dayly sacrifice also, which sacrifice is a commemoration or memory of the other bloudy sacrifice, once offered on the crosse, and yet conteyneth the same reall body of our Sauour, which the other did, after another manner. And by this will the reader easily discouer diuers poore shifts & fallacyes of our moderne heretiks, especially of Ridley before named, who as yow haue heard him professe, was moued to leaue his ancie[n]t faith of the masse, & his practice therin, for that in some certaine places (for sooth) of the Fathers, he found that this sacrifice (of the masse) is called a commemoration of Christs passion; a stronge argument, no doubt, to moue him to so great a resolution. And so much of this.

Note this
example.

42. Now then are to be examined the other words, *sacramentally, really, and spiri*tually: and as

for

for the first, the common sense, and meaninge of schoole diuines is, that diuised this word, to signifie therby a peculiar manner of Christs supernaturall being in the Sacrament, different from his naturall and circumscriptrue being in heauen, and from the naturall being of an Angell definitiue in a place, wherof we haue spoken before. So as, when they say that Christ is sacramentally vnder the formes of bread and wyne, they do not deny his true and reall being there in flesh, the very selfe-same that is in heauen; but he is there in another manner. And this is the chiefe proper signification of the word *sacramentally* amongst schoole-men, for which the word was invented.

Two significations of the word *sacramentally* and both against the Sacramentaries.

1.

43. But in the common vse, and sense of our speech, *sacramentally* signifieth, that Christs body is there vnder a Sacrament or signe, which are the formes of bread and wyne, and not in his owne proper shape, euē as an Angell, when he appeareth in a body, he may be said to appeare bodyly, for that the body is the figure or forme, vnder which he appeareth; and conforme to this sense, we are said to receiue Christ *sacramentally*, when we receaue him truly and really, but yet not in his proper forme, but vnder another forme, that is to say of bread and wyne, wherby the fraudulent dealing of our moderne Sacramentaries may appeare, who deceauing the people with this word *sacramentally*, do oppose yt to *really* and *truly*, as though when any author saith, that

2.

We

we receaue Christ sacramentally in the Eucharist, yt were to be vnderstood, that we did not receaue Christs body in deed and really, but only a signe therof, and by this they endeavour to delude all the places, though neuer so euident, of holy Fathers affirminge, that Christs true flesh and body, the very same that was borne of the virgin Mary and crucified for vs, is receaued in the Sacrament, these good fellowes aunswere that yt is true, *sacramentally*, which we also graunt, yf *sacramentally*, do not exclude really, accordinge to the true signification of the word: But yf by *sacramentally*, they meane as they do, that only a signe is receaued of Christs body in the Sacrament, then is their deceyt manifest as yow see; for that *sacramentally*, hath no such signification at all amonge diuines, but only is diuised amonge them for a shift.

What the
word spi-
ritually si-
gnifeth in
this my-
stery.

44. The like fraud they vse about the word *spiritually*, which in the sense of holy Fathers, being opposite to carnally and corporally, in their ordinary materiall signification, is by sectaryes also wrested, as though yt were contrary to the word *really*, so as whensoever they are forced to graunt Christs body to be spiritually in the Sacrament (by which phrase the said ancient Fathers do meane only, that he is not there after a carnall, or common manner, as he liued vpon earth) they will haue yt vnderstood, that he is there only by faith, and not in deed really and substantially. They abuse also the signification of the foresaid wordes carnally

carnally & corporally, which hauing a double sense, the one that Christs body is naturally and really in the Sacrament, the other that he is there after the externall being of other bodies, they deceytfully do take them now in one sense, and now in another, and alwayes oppose them to the word *spiritually*, which in the former sense are not incompatible, but may stand together, though not in the later. And for auoydinge of this equiuocation, diuines do wish those two words, carnally and corporally, though true in the foresaid sense, yet to be more sparingly vsed, then the other words really and substantially, that are equiualent in sense, and lesse subiect to equiuocation and mistaking.

45. Wherefore to conclude this obseruation, all these words are to be noted, and their true vse and signification remembred by him, that will not be deluded by hereticall sleights and impostures in this high mystery, but especially are to be obserued these three, wherby our Sacramentaries do most of all deceyue the vulgar people, in their assertions and answers to our arguments, to witt, *sacramentally*, *spiritually* and *by faith*, as though they did exclude the reall presence of Christs body in the Sacrament; which is most false, for that in the true sense we admitt them all. For example, we graunt that Christ is sacramentally in this Sacrament, both as sacramentally signifieth a distinct manner of Christs being there, from that in heauen, and as yt signifieth his being there

Our here-
likes cauill
like to
that of the
Artians.

there vnder a Sacrament or signe, but yet really, we graunt also that he is there spirituallly, that is to say, after a spirituall, and not corporall circumscripitiue manner, yet truly and really. We graunt further, that he is in the Sacrament by faith, for that we do not see him, but appprehend him present by faith, but yet truly and really, and not in faith and beleefe only. And by this yow may perceauē our Sacramentaryes manner of disputinge; iust like the Arrians of old tyme, and of our dayes, who seeke to enacuate all places alleaged for the vnity and equality of Christ with his Father, by one only distinction of will and nature: So as when Christ said for example *Ioan. 6. my Father and I are one*, yt is true said they, they are one in will & loue, but not in nature; & thus they deluded all that could be brought for naturall vnity, except only the authority, and contrary beleefe of the vniuersall Church; wherby at last they were ouerborne.

46. And the very same course held the Sacramentaryes of our dayes; for whatsoeuer plaine and perspicuous places you bring them out of antiquity, affirminge the true naturall substantiall body of our Sauour, to be in the Sacrament, they will shift of all presently, by one of these three words; yt is true, *sacramentally*, yt is true *spirituallly*, and yt is true *by faith only*, as though these could not stand with *really* or *truly*; and heereof shall yow haue store of examples afterward in the aunswerings of

Doflor

Doctor Perne, Crammer, Ridley and Larymer for the Sacramentary party to our arguments, taken out of the ancient Fathers. For when the said Fathers do auouch, that Christ our Sauours true naturall body is in the Sacrament, they answere, *yt is true sacramentally*, and thinke they haue defended themselves manfully therby, and when in other places the same Fathers do professe, that the very same flesh that was borne of the virgin Mary and crucified for vs, is there, they aunswere, *yt is true spiritually* and by faith, but not really. And thus they do euacuate and delude all that can be alleaged: But yf they cannot shew (as they cannot) any one Father that tooke or vsed the words *sacramentally*, *spiritually*, or *by faith*, in this sense, as opposite to *really* and *truly* in this mystery, then is it euident, this to be but a shift of their owne inuention, to escape therby. And so much of this obseruation.

The nynt Observaution.

How Christ is receaued of euill men in the Sacrament, and of good men both in, and out of the same. §. 9.

47. It followeth vpon the former declaration of the words, *sacrament*, *signe*, and the rest, that we explaine in this place, a certayne distinction insinuated by the ancient Fathers, and touched in the Councell of Trent, of three sorts of receauinge and eatinge Christ by this

N

Sacra-

Council. Trid.
dent. sess.
13. Can. 10.

D. Thom. 3.
part. 9. 80.
art. 1.

Sacrament: First sacramentally alone, the second spiritually only, the third both sacramentally and spiritually together. An example of the first is, when euill men do receaue the Sacrament vnworthily, for that these men, though they receaue the very Sacrament, to witt the true body of Christ vnder the formes of bread and wyne, yet do they not receaue the true spirituall effect therof, which is grace and nourishment of their soule, and of these doth S. Paul speake expressely to the *Corinthians*, when he saith: *He that eateth and drinketh vnworthily (videlicet the Sacrament) doth eat and drinke iudgement to himselfe, not discerninge the body of our Lord.* And in this sense do the auncient Fathers vpon this place, expound the Apostle, as yow may see in the commentaries of *Sami Chrysostome*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Anselme*, and other expositors both Greeke and Latyn; and *S. Austen* in many places of his works doth expressely shew the same, alleaginge this text of the Apostle for prooffe therof, *Corpus Domini* (saith he) *& sanguis Domini nihilominus erat illis, quibus dicebat Apostolus, &c.* It was notwithstanding the body & bloud of our Lord, which they tooke, to whome the Apostle said; he that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, eateth and drinketh his owne damnation. And to the same effect he saith in diuers other places, that *Iudas* receaued the very selfe-same body of Christ, that the other Apostles did; and the same affirmeth *S. Chrysostome* in his homily intituled, of the *Treason of Iudas*; & generally it is the vniforme opinion

Aug. l. 5.
de bapt.
cap. 8.

Aug. epist.
162. & in
psalm. 104.

opin
locu
ther
48.
by t
for
Chr
case
of,
this
videl
yt ad
ther
do co
che
spir
fen
mand
to th
whe
ricall
trami
men
thou
in th
is fur
thou
speak
49.
tion i
spir
with
ceau

Opinion of all the auncient Fathers, whensoever any occasion is given to speake or treat thereof.

48. The second manner of receauing Christ by this Sacrament, is tearmed *spiritually* only; for that without sacramentall receauinge of Christs body and bloud, a man may in some case receaue the spirituall fruite or effect thereof, as yf he had receaued the same really, and this eyther with relation to the Sacrament, *videlicet*, when a man hath a desire to receaue yt actually, but cannot; or without reference therunto, when by faith and grace good men do communicate with Christ, and participate the fruite of his passion. In which sense of spirituall communion, or eating Christ, *S. Austen* wryteth vpon *S. Iohns* gospell, *Crede & manducasti*, beleene, and thou hast eaten. And to the same effect do our Fathers often speake, when they treat of this spirituall & metaphoricall eating only without relation to the Sacrament: which manner of speeches the Sacramentaryes of our dayes do seeke to abuse, as though there were no other eatinge of Christ in the Sacrament, but by faith alone, which is furthest of from the said Fathers meaninge, though sometymes they had occasion to speake in that manner.

*Aug. trict.
25. in Ioh.*

49. The third member of our former diuision is, to eat Christ both sacramentally and spiritually, as all good Christians do, when with due preparation & disposition, they receaue both the outward Sacrament and in-

ward grace and fruite therof: by obseruation of which threefold manner of receauing, many obiections and hereticall cauillations will easily afterward be discerned. And so much for this.

The tenth Obseruation.

Touchinge indignities and inconueniences obiected by Sacramentaries against vs, in holdinge the Reall presence. §. 10.

50. As by the former obiections of naturall impossibilityes, yow haue heard this soueraigne mystery impugned, both by the learner sort of old and new heretiks; so do the more simple & ignorant insist & insult most, vpon certayne inconueniences, indignities, and absurdities, as to them do appeare. As for example, that Christ in the Sacrament, should be eaten with mens teeth, go into the belly, not only of men & weomen, but also of beasts yf they should deuoure yt, that yt may putrifie, be burned, cast and fall into base and vnworthy places, be troden vnder mens feet, with the like, which is a kind of argument plausible at the first sight vnto vulgar apprehensions, and such as seemed to moue principally the most part of Iohn Fox his artificers, and spinster-martyrs, as may appeare by their rude clamours, and grosse obiections, exprobrations, irrisions, iests and scoffes at their aunsweringe before their ordinaries.

51. And

51. And heerin also they shewed their spiritt of derydinge and blaspheminge that, which they vnderstood not, to concurre with that of the pagans and Iewes against the whole body of Christian Religion, and of auncient heretiks against the principall articles therof. Of the pagans *S. Augustine* wryteth thus: *In ipsum Christum non crederemus, si fides Christiana cunctinuum metueret paganorum*; We should not beleue in Christ himselfe, yf Christian faith did feare the scoffinge of pagans. *S. Paul* also wryteth both of Gentills and Iewes, that the Crosse of Christ (that is to say, that God should be apprehended, beaten, wounded and crucified) was to these a scandall, and folly to the others, though vnto the elect, yt was the very wisdome, power & vertue of God himselfe. We read also in the ghospell, that the *Saduces* amongst the Iewes, scoffed at the resurrection of bodyes, by asking Christ a question of a woman that had seauen husbands, whose wife she should be in the resurrection, purposing therby to haue inferred an absurdity against the said article, to witt, that eyther seauen men should haue striued for one woman, or one woman haue byn wife of seauen men. And the *Marcionists* infamous heretiks, that tooke the same heresie from the *Sadduces*, as also the *Originists* concurring therin against the said beleefe of our resurrection, went about to disgrace the same, as both *Tertullian*, and *S. Hierome* do testifie, by certaine absurd indignities, which they imagined would ensue therof,

Aug. ep. 49. q. 6.

1. Cor. 1.

Matth. 22.

Tertul. l. de resur. caro. l. i. in op. ad Pama-chinum.

therof, as for example that difference of sexes procreation, mydwyues, nurses, priuyes, and the like, must needs be in heauen, but the aun-
 cient Fathers answered them with the words
 of our Sauour to the said Sadduces, *Erratis, ne-*
scientes scripturam, & virtutem Dei. Yow do erre,
 not knowinge the scriptures, nor the power
 of God.

Matth. xi.

52. And the same aunswere was giuen by
 Catholiks to the first Sacramentaryes, that
 euer publicly appeared, to witt the *Berenga-*
rians about 500. yeares past, who obiected the
 very same absurdities, that our hereriks do at
 this day, as testifieth *Guilmundus* and *Algerus*,
 that liued in that age and wrote against them;
 they were aunswered (I say) that their error
 proceeded of not vnderstandinge the true
 meaning of scriptures, nor the power of God,
 which in the Sacrament conserueth his body
 without all leasion, hurt, indignity, or incon-
 uenience, whatsoeuer happeneth vnto the
 formes, vnder which his body is, and that it is
 nothing so base and vnworthy a matter, euen
 in our sense & comon reason, that Christ our
 Sauour being impasible in the Sacrament,
 should vnder another forme be said to fall on
 the ground, to be burned, to be eaten, &c.
 then in his owne proper forme, when he was
 pasible, and sensible to ly in his mothers
 wombe, or to cry and weepe in the cradle, or
 to suffer hunger, thirst, and other humayne
 necessaries, and to be whipped, wounded and
 put to death, all which indignities, supposing
 that

Guilmundus
lib. 2. &
Algerus
lib. 2. cont.
Berenga-
rius.

that he was the selfe-same God that created the world, might seeme more absurd, and improbable in common sense and reason, then this of the Sacrament, and so they did seeme to old heretiks, who obiected and derided the same, as the forsaide *Marcionists*, that God should be in a womans belly, and in a maunger; and *Nestorius* the heretike, that God should be two monethes old for example, and two cubitts bigg, and other such iests and scoffes, as yow may read of them in *Tertullian*, *Theodoret*, *Eugrius* and other wryters.

53. Wherefore to conclude this obseruation, two points are to be noted in this whole matter: First that many things that seeme to happen to Christ in these cases, do not touch him indeed, but only the externall formes of bread and wyne, as when they are burned for example, do putrifie, or the like, Christs body is not burned, or putrified, but ceaseth to be vnder them, when the said formes or accidents are corrupted, for that the substance of Christs body, supplyinge the substance of bread, is no longer there then the substance of bread would haue byn there, yf yt had not ben conuerted into Christs body, but yf bread had remayned, yt would haue ceased by any kind of corruption, as burninge, putrifyinge, or the like, and so doth Christs body, though in a different sort, so that the substance of bread might, by the said corruption, be chaunged into some other substance, which Christs body cannot be, but only ceaseth to be there, God

*Tert. lib. de
earn. Christi
& Theod.
l. 4. heret.
fabul. &
Eugr. l. 1.
hist. c. 2.*

supplyinge some other matter for production of that, which is brought forth of new, as in the former obseruation hath byn declared.

Notethese
two ex-
amples.

54. The other point, that those other conditions which by reason of the formes are ascribed vnto Christ his body in the Sacrament, as to moue from place to place, when the formes are moued, to be seene, touched, eaten with our teeth and the like, which are frequent phrases among the Fathers, haue no inconuenience amonge them at all, no more for example, then when our soule is said to be moued with the motion of the body, which soule notwithstandinge of his owne nature is not moueable: so as an Angell being a spiritt, may be handled, seene, or stroken in the body which he taketh to appeare in, as is euident by the whole story of *Tobias* and other places of scripture, which Angell of himselfe notwithstandinge, is not capable of such thinges; and finally Gods eternall diuinity and maiesty is present in all places & things, the most basest and horrible that can be diuised, and yet suffereth no inconuenience therby: For though he be for example in the dunghill, yet he cannot be said to haue any euill smell therby, neyther to be burned in the fire, though the formes of bread and wyne be burned therin, nor to putrifie, though he be actually present in those things that rott and putrifie. And by this may yow see the vayne calumniations of fond heretiks, against the power of almighty God, out of their senses and foolish imaginations.

The

The eleuenth Obseruation.

About the nature of a sacrifice, as it is ordayned to different effectes, and how that of the Crosse standeth vvith that of the masse. §. 11.

55. The eleuenth and last obseruation shalbe peculiarly about the last of the three questions proposed, which is sacrifice of the masse, noting therein two ends, offices, or effects to be considered: First that yt is ordayned *ad cultum externum*, to an externall worshipp of God peculiar to himselfe, in the highest degree of honour, called by the Gretians *Latria*: secondly *ad propitiationem pro peccatis*, for pacifyinge of Gods wrath for sinnes, and albeit both these effects may be in one and the selfe-same sacrifice (and so we hould them to be in the sacrifice of the masse, for that yt was ordayned by Christ, as well for a perpetuall outward honour & worshipp to be exhibited vnto God in the Christian Church vnto the worlds end, as also for remission of sinnes by application of the meritt of Christs bloody sacrifice on the Crosse) yet may they be separated of their owne natures, so as a sacrifice may be ordayned only *ad cultum*, that is to say, for an externall worshipp only, without power to remitt sinnes: And so in a manner were the sacrifices of the ould law, which little or nothing awayled for sinnes. And againe, sacrifice may be ordeined only or principally to satisfy for sinnes, without

without relation therof *ad cultum*, to perseuere in any state of men, to be often offered by them, and such was Christs on the Crosse, which is not reiterated againe in the same bloudy and passible manner, as then yt was, but in another farre different sort in the masse, which is capable of both these effects, as hath byn said.

The first
effect of
sacrifice,

56. Now then in the first sense, as a sacrifice is ordayned *ad cultum*, to an externall worship of God, yt conteyneth an outward protestation of our knowledge of Gods supreme Maiestie, power, and absolute dominion ouer vs, and in our subiection therunto, which is the highest honour that can be giuen by a creature vnto the creator, and is so particular to God alone, as hath byn said, as yt cannot be imparted to any creature, without the horrible sinne of Idolatry, and is so conioyned with the nature of Religion yt selfe, as no true Religion hath euer byn without this degree of externall honour, exhibited vnto God by his people; and so we see that all good men in the law of nature, by Gods instinct, did sacrifice vnto him, as *Adam, Abell, Noe, Melchisedecke*, and others, as afterwards also in the law of Moyse, the same was expressely ordayned by Gods owne commandement; & the Gentills did the same, though not to one true God, but to many idolls, by suggestion of the diuell, that therein emulated Gods honour exhibited vnto him by sacrifice. And this for the first effect or office of sacrifice.

57. The

57. The second is *propitiation*, or pacifyinge of Gods wrath for sinnes, as hath byn said. Wherin for more perspicuityes sake, three degrees may be obserued. First of such sacrifices as were so weake & imperfect in themselves, touching this point of propitiation and satisfyinge for sinnes, as they profited little or nothinge, except only as they were morall good works; and accordinge to the piety of the offerer, they might help somewhat; but they had neyther sufficient force in themselves to remitt sinnes, neyther to apply the vertue and satisfaction of any other sacrifice, already exhibited, to the remission thereof, but were only figures, and shaddowes of things to come: and such were the sacrifices of the old law of Moyses.

58. The second degree is quite opposite to this for excellency of perfection, power and meritt, being in yt selfe of so infinite valour, as yt is sufficient not only fully to satisfie for the sinnes of all the world; but also to giue vigour to all other sacrifices, both internall, and externall; And this was the sacrifice of Christ our Sauour on the Crosse; & betweene these two sacrifices, to witt the weaknesse and imperfection, multitude and variety of the one vnder the old law, and the singularity, excellency, force and infinite power of the other, is the large *antithesis* & opposition, vsed by *S. Paul* in his 9. and 10. Chapters of his Epistle to the *Hebrewes*, shewing, that as the Iewes sacrifices were many in number, and of diuers sorts and infirme

The second
effect of
sacrifice
with 3.
degrees
therof.

infirmes of themselues, & therefore offered vp in great multitudes and often; so the sacrifice of Christ for the excellency therof, and infinite force and valour, was single, & but one, and once offered for all, and not iterable for acquiringe the price of mans redemption, and perfect sufficiency for the sanctifyinge of all, though yet he affirmeth not, that yt may not be iterated in another manner, & to another effect, to witt for applyinge the sufficiency & meritt of this one sacrifice offered for all, to the vtility of particular people: For albeit Christ hath satisfied for all *quoad sufficientiam* (to vse the termes of schoole) yet not *quoad efficaciam*, which is as much to say, as albeit Christ hath redeemed all and paid the price for all, yet all are not saued therby, nor do receaue the efficacy or benefitt therof, for that they apply not to their owne vtility that which is gayned for all.

— 59. Now then for applyinge this treasure vnto people in particular, our aduersaryes do confesse, that some things are necessary of our parts, as faith & baptisme, but we do ad more meanes, as ordayned by Christ himselve, and amonge other the sacrifice of the masse, not for acquiringe any new price or sufficiency of our saluation, but for applyinge the effect or efficacy of that, which already is gotten by Christ our Sauour, through his passion on the Crosse, & heerof resulteth a third degree of propitiatory sacrifice, that is neyther so infirme as the sacrifices of the ould law were, that

that remytted not sinnes, nor yet in a manner of so potent effect, as to acquire the price of our saluation, for that yt is not offered vp to that end, but only to apply the vertue of the other sacrifice already gotten, and so may be iterated, not for any defect in it selfe, but for that sinnes dayly growinge haue need of dayly application of the said sacrifice, as hath byn said.

60. And in this sense do all the ancient Fathers, in the places before alleaged, call this sacrifice of the masse iuge *sacrificium*, a dayly sacrifice, and iterable, notwithstandinge that the other on the Crosse could be offered but once, as S. Paul proueth. And now these obseruations being premised, we shall passe to examine and aunswere the arguments of our aduersaryes, in all the former disputations brought forth.

T H E

THE EXAMINATION OF SVCH ARGVMENTES

As in the former disputations were alleaged by the Zuinglians & Calvinists, against the reall-presence of Christes body in the Sacrament.

C H A P. I V.

Two
things to
be consi-
dered.

No vv then to ioine more neerly with our Sacramentaryes, and to come to the vew of particular arguments, brought forth against the article of the *reall-presence*, yt is to be held in memory, that which before we haue noted: first, that these new Doctours hauinge no one direct place eyther of scriptures, or Fathers for their purpose, that expressely denyeth the said *reall-presence* (as we haue for the affirmative) they are forced to runne to certayne inferences, as *for that Christ is in heauen, he cannot be in the Sacrament*, & such other like of no validity, as presently yow shall see. And secondly it is to be remembred, that these arguments (the most wherof are founded on sense and humayne reason against faith) are ordinarily to be found both alleaged, yrged and answered

swered in all our Schoolmens books at large, before our Sacramentaryes were borne, and consequently these men bring no new things, as worthy of a new labour. But yet for better satisfaction of them, that haue not read the said Schoolmen, nor are of sufficient learning to see the solution of themselves, we shall breiefely runne ouer in this place, whatsoeuer was obiected by the said Sacramentaryes, of any moment in all the former disputations, or other conferences, colloquyes, or examinations, reducinge all for more perspicuityes sake vnto certaine heads or groundes in manner followinge.

The first head or ground of Sacramentary obiections; for that yt seemeth impossible to them, that Christes body can be in many places at once. §. 1.

1. This is the first principall ground of all the Sacramentaryes vnbeleefe, and out of which they draw the greatest squadron of all their arguments and obiections, as presently yow shall see, for that yt is a point very plausible to comon-sense and humayne reason, that a naturall body naturally cannot be but in one place at once; but he that shall read our obseruations in the precedēt Chapter, where we haue shewed, that not only supernaturally and by Gods omnipotent power yt may be done,

done; but that it comprehendeth not so much as any contradiction in nature it selfe; and further shall consider, that albeit Christs true and naturall body be in the Sacrament at many places at once, yet not after a naturall manner, but supernaturall and miraculous, as euery where the ancient Fathers do admonish vs (and we haue alleaged many of their admonitions before) he I say that shall consider this, will easily contemne and laughe at the vanity of so many Sacramentary arguments, founded vpon this weake ground and principle only, *that a naturall body cannot be in more places then one at once*, which is true naturally, that is to say by the ordinary course of nature, but by the power of God, that is aboue nature, yt may be, and this without an essentiall contradiction, as I haue said, in nature yt selfe.

3. Well then, now will I sett downe the whole Squadron of arguments, which out of this false principle, or rather true principle misvnderstood, Iohn Fox layeth forth with great ostentation out of *Peter Martyr* his Oxford disputations, which arguments are 8. in number, and did seeme so insoluble vnto Fox his diuinity, and philosophy, as he putterh no answer at all giuen by the Catholike defendants to the same. I shall deliuer them also in dialecticall forme, as they ly in Fox this once, together with his foolery of cytinge the moods and figures of sophistry in the margent to euery argument, a thinge knowen to euery child that beginneth logique, & consequently

is ri-

is ridiculous to men of learninge, though strange to the ignorant people, that may imagine great secrets to ly hidden in those words of *Disamis*, *Datij*, *Baroco*, *Festino*, *Bocardo*, and thinke that Iohn Fox doth go about to coniure vs his readers, by settinge them downe: but now to the arguments themselues.

1. Argument.

- Di- 4. * The true naturall body of Christ is placed in heauen. *Matth. 24. & 26. Ioan. 12. & 16. Act. 3. Colloß. 3.* a It is graunted.
- Ja- b The true naturall body of man can be but in one place at once, where he is. b It is true naturally.
August. ad Dardanum, propter veri corporis modum, saith he, that is for the manner of a true body.
- mis. c Ergo the true naturall body of Christ can be in noe place at once, but in heauen where he is. c But yt may be supernaturally.

2. Argument.

- Da- d Euery true naturall body requireth one certayne place. d That is by course of nature.
- ri- e Christs body is a true naturall body. e True.
- f Ergo. Christs body requireth one certayne place. f True naturally.

3. Argument.

- g Augustine giueth not to the soule of Christ g It is true according
- O

to the ordinary nature of a soule.

b The one and the other may be by Gods omnipotēcy.

i True according to their ordinary course of nature.

k Christ in the Sacramēt filleth no place.

l This is false for Fox his soule was in his foote and head, and yet not God.
m Naturally.

n This is false.

Christ to be in more places at once then one. *Aug. ad Dardan.*

b Ergo. Much lesse yt is to be giuen to the body of Christ, to be in more places at once then one.

4. Argument.

i The nature of Angells is not to be in diuers places, but they are limited to occupy one certayne place at once. *Basil. de spiritu sancto. cap. 22.*

k Ergo. The body of Christ being the true naturall body of man, cannot fill diuers places at once.

5. Argument.

BA- *l* Whatsoever is in many & diuers places at once, is God.

ro- The body of Christ is not God, but a creature.

co. *m* Ergo. The body of Christ cannot be in more places together.

6. Argument.

Fe- We must not so defend the diuinity of Christ, as we destroy his humanity.

sti- *n* Yf we assigne more places to the body of Christ, we destroy his humanity.

no. Ergo. We must not assigne to the body of Christ plurality of places.

7. Argument.

- Fe- * Whatsoever thinge is circumscribed, that is to say, conteyned in the limitts of any peculiar place, cannot be dispersed into more places at once. * This graunted.
- fi- * The body of Christ is a thinge circumscribed. p It is true de facto in heauē, but not in the Sacramēt.
- no. * Ergo the body of Christ is not dispersed into more places at one tyme. q True as it is circumscribed.

8. Argument.

- Da- * Euery quantity, that is euery body hauing magnitude, length, and other dimensions, is circumscribed in one peculiar place. *Cyrill. de trinit. lib. 2.* * True naturally but not supernaturally.
- ti- * The body of Christ hath his dimensions, and is a quantity. * True, though a body is not a quantity, but a substance that hath quantity.
- j. * Ergo the body of Christ is circumscribed. * Non sequitur.

Aunswere.

§. These are the doughty arguments, which Fox affirmeth their great Patriarke Peter Martyr to haue alleaged against the reall-presence, out of this first philosophicall ground, *that one body cannot be in many places at once*; Whervnto I might aunswere in the words of S. Augustine, to such kind of men, as measure Gods power by their owne imagination: *Ecce qualibus argumentis, omnipotentia Dei, humana contradicit infirmi-*

Aug. l. 25. de Ciuit. Dei cap. 11.

tas, quam possidet vanitas: behould with what kind of arguments, the infirmity of man, possessed by vanity, doth contradict Gods omnipotency. Yf yow read the fourth and fifth observations sett downe in the former Chapter, yow will easily see both the infirmity, and vanity of all these arguments, & how this great variety vpon one ground, are but minced-meats guised in diuers sorts and fashions, by the art of Fox and Peter Martyrs cookery, and yet are they held for great demonstrations, and stronge fortresses of the Sacramentary faith, or rather infidelity, and vrged euery where by their followers.

6. John Rogers vsed the same argument in his defence before the Bishops, as yow may see in Fox pag. 1351. *Christ is corporally* (saith he) *in heauen only, ergo not in the Sacrament*, where he vseth an equiuocation also in the word corporally, for that we do not say, that Christ is corporally in the Sacrament, yf by corporally he meane not only really and substantially, but also after a corporall manner, accordinge to externall dimensions. Thomas Tompkins the weauer of Shordich, vseth the same argument against his Ordinary in like manner, to witt, *that Christs body cannot be in the Sacrament, for that yt is in heauen.* Fox pag. 1395. Maister Gueft in his Cambridge disputations against Doctor Glyn, leained principally to this argument, and B. Ridley, his moderator, or president of these disputations, vrged a place of *S. Augustine ad Dardanum* to the same effect. *Tolle spatia corporibus, & nusquam erunt*

Take

Take away the spaces from bodyes (saith *S. Austen*) and they shalbe no where. But *D. Glyn* defendant answered him well, that *S. Augustine* spake expressely of the naturall being of bodyes, accordinge to their ordinary externall dimensions, and not how they might be by Gods supernaturall power and omnipotency.

7. But aboue all others, *Philpott* did keep reuell in the conuocation house about this argument, against *Maister Morgan*, & *Maister Harpesfield*, alleaginge diuers places of scripture for the same, but little to the purpose God woote, as that of *S. Paul*: *Christ is like vnto vs in all points, except sinne*. And therefore said he, as one of our bodyes cannot be at *Paules*, and at *V Vestminster* togeather; so cannot *Christ* be in *heauen*, and in the *Sacrament*. But yt was told him, that these words of *S. Paul*, were true in *S. Paules* sense, but yet that *Christs* body was vnlike also vnto vs besides sinne, in diuers other points, as for example, in that he was begotten without the seed of man, and that his body was inuisible, when he would haue it soe, and that he rose out of the sepulcher the same being shutt, and diuers other like points, which our ordinary naturall bodyes haue not, though God of his omnipotency might giue the same to our bodyes also. Then he alleaged the sayinge of *S. Peter* in the *Acts*: *VVhome beauen must receaue vntill the consumation of the world*. Wherof he would inferre a necessity of *Christs* remayning in *heauen*, vntill the day

Philpot his styre in the conuocation house about this argument.

Fox pag. 1282.

2. Tim.

of iudgement. Then *Morgan* laughed at this (saith *Fox*) *Harpesfield* stood vp, and asked him how he vnderstood that place, *Oportet Episcopum esse vnius vxoris virum*, A Bishop must be the husband of one wife. And whether this be of such necessity, as he may not be without a wife, one at least? With which demaund *Philpott* was so entangled, as he could not well go forward, as there yow may see, and refused to aunswere *Maister Morgan*, as the prolocutor would haue had him.

8. Well then, this is the first and principall ground and bulwarke of all Sacramentary vnbeleefe in this article, that Christs body cannot be by Gods omnipotent power in two places at once, to witt both in heauen, and in the Sacrament, which we haue shewed before in our fourth, fifth and sixt obseruations, to be a fond and temerarious position, wherunto we referre the reader to see the grounds more at large, and heere only we shall say a word or two to the former eight arguments, as they lye in order. Yet first it shalbe good for the reader to remember that, which we haue noted before in the story of *Melancthon*, who saith, *I had rather offer my selfe to death, then to asserme, as the Zuinglians do, that Christes body cannot be but in one place at once.* But yet *Peter Martyr*, *Philpott*, *Cranmer*, and their fellowes would dye, and some of them also did dye, for the contrary, so as Saints of one Calendar, do heere dye for contrary opinions one to the other. But let vs answere the arguments.

Melancthon.
Epistola ad
Martinum
Gerolimum.

8. To

8. To the first we say, concerning the minor proposition, that a true naturall body, naturally, and by ordinary course of nature, cannot be at one tyme, but in one place, and that meaneth *S. Augustine ad Dardanum*, but supernaturally, and by Gods omnipotent power, that exceedeth nature, yt repugneth not to be in diuers places at once, yf God will haue yt so: as in our fifth obseruation is proued. To the second argument we say, that euery true naturall body requireth one certaine place by ordinary course of nature, and not otherwise. To the third, that soules and spiritts by their naturall course haue but one totall place, wherein they may be said to be, as one soule in one body, and one Angell in the place, that it pleaseth to occupye, or to haue operation therein: albeit yf we respect partiall places of the same body, as head, foote, finger and the like, the selfe-same soule is wholly in diuers places at once, which is no lesse wonderfull and incredible to our sense, then for a bodily substance, to be in two distinct places at once. And the like is in the Angell, who may occupy, for example, a whole house or towne for his totall place, and yet be in euery particular and partiall place therof wholly and entyrelly, which is graunted both by all philosophers and diuynes, though vulgar sense cannot apprehend yt.

9. To the fourth may be answered the very same, as to the former, that the being of Angells in place definitiuelly, is like in all respects

To the first argument.

To the second.

To the third.

To the fourth.

To the
fifth.

to that of the soule. Read our fourth obseruation in the precedent Chapter. To the fifth argument the aunswere is easy, for we deny that whatsoeuer is in diuers places at once, is God, for that by his omnipotent power a creature may be: yt is Gods priuiledge that he is euery where wholly and entyrelly, *ex vi natura diuina*, by force of his diuine nature, that is to say, he is so euery-where, as he cannot be but euery where, which is not true eyther in a spiritt, or in Christs body, or in any other creature whatsoeuer; for that all creatures, as they haue limited natures, so are they limited also in place, and restrayned from vbiquity, or being euery where, which is proper and peculiar to almighty God alone: & so to speake of the body of Christ in particular, yt is not euery-where; and we detest both the *Eutichian* vbiquitaryes, that held Christs body to be euery-where, as confounded with his diuinity; and no lesse the Lutheran vbiquitaryes of our dayes, that hold Christs body to be euery where, by reason of the coniunction with Christs diuinity; the Catholike faith affirming only, that Christs body, though naturally it be but in one place, yet by Gods omnipotency it may be in more.

To the
sixt.

10. To the sixth argument we deny the *Minor*, to witt, that we destroy Christs humanity by grauntinge, that yt may be in diuers places at once; for that yt repugneth not to a humayne creature, to be in more places then one by Gods omnipotency: this we haue shewed
more

more largely in our fifth obseruation. To the
 seauenth we deny also the *Minor*; that Christs
 body in the Sacrament is to be circumscribed,
 or circumscriptiue there, as yt is in heauen.
 The differences betweene three manners of
 being, to witt, circumscriptiue, definitiue,
 and sacramentally, yow may see more at large
 declared in our fourth and fifth obseruations.
 To the eight and last, we say that the maior is
 to be vnderstood naturally, and not superna-
 turally by diuine power: to the *Minor*, we aun-
 swere, that Christs body hath not externall
 dimensions in the Sacrament, though yt haue
 in heauen: and in the Sacrament yt hath only
 internall and inuisible quantity, without ex-
 tension to place; wherof yow may read more
 in the fourth and fifth obseruations. And this
 shalbe sufficient for this first ground of philo-
 sophicall arguments. Now will we passe to
 the second.

To the
 seauenth.

To the
 cyght.

*The second head or ground of Sacra-
 mentary argumentes, drawen
 from contrary qualityes or
 quantityes, &c. §. 2.*

11. This second ground is not much diffe-
 rent from the former, for both of them are
 founded on sense, and humayne reason, and
 heere I will not conioyne all the arguments
 togea-

together, as before I did, but set them downe feuerally, as Fox recordeth them out of *Peter Martyrs* disputation.

I. *Argument.*

- 84- Yf Christ had giuen his body substantially and carnally in the supper, then was that body eyther passible or impassible.
- 70- But neyther can yow say that body to be passible or impassible, which he gaue at supper: not passible for that *S. Austen* denyeth yt *Psalm. 98.* not impassible, for that Christ saith: *This is my body, vvhich shalbe giuen for yow.*
60. Ergo he did not giue his body substantially at supper.

Answer.

12. And this same argument vsed others after *Peter Martyr*, as *Pilkilton* against *Doctor Glym*, & alleagerh the same place of *S. Austen*, as yow may see in Fox pag. 1259. But the matter is easily answered, for that the minor or second proposition is cleerly false, for that Christs body giuen in the supper, though yt were the same in substance, that was giuen on the Crosse, the next day after, yet was yt deliuered at the supper in another manner, to witt in manner impassible, & vnder the formes of bread and wyne, so as according to the being, which

which yt hath in the Sacrament, no naturall
cause could exercise any action vpon yt,
though being the selfe same which was to
dye vpon the Crosse, yt is also possible, euen
as now in heauen it is visible, & in the Sacra-
ment inuisible, though one & the selfe same
body, & now in both places glorious and im-
mortall, & this meaneth expressely *S. Austen* in
the place alleaged, whose words cited by Fox
are: *Yow are not to eat this body that yow see, nor to
drinke the bloud that they are to shedd who shall crucifie
me.* Which words being spoken to them, that
were scandalized at his speech about the ea-
tinge of his body, do shew that we are in deed
to eate his true flesh in the Sacrament, but not
after that carnall manner, which they imagi-
ned: *carnaliter cogitauerunt* (saith *S. Austen* in the
same place) & *putauerunt, quod praeisurus esset Do-*
minus particulas quasdam de corpore suo, & daturus
illis. They imagined carnally, and thought
that Christ would haue cutt of certayne
peeces of his body, and giuen vnto them;
which grosse imagination our Sauour refu-
teth by tellinge them, that they should eat his
true body, but in another forme of bread
and wyne.

13. And yet that yt is the selfe-same body &
the selfe-same bloud, the same Doctor and
Father affirmeth expressely, both in this and
many other places. *Verè magnus Dominus, &c.* he
is in deed a great God, that hath giuen to eat
his owne body, in which he suffered so many,
and great thinges for vs. And againe talkinge
of his

*S. Augu-
stines sen-
tence of
drinkinge
Christis
bloud.*

”
”

*Aug. in
exposit.
Psalm. 33.*

In Psalm.
65.

Traff. 31.
in Ioan.

De utilita
panis. c. 1.

Lib. 2. con-
tra aduers.
leg. &
proph. c. 9.

of his tormentors: *Ipsū sanguinem quem per insaniā fuderant, per gratiam biberunt.* The selfe-same blood which by fury they sheed, by grace they dronke. And yet further of the same: *Quousq; biberent sanguinem quem fuderunt;* mercy left them not, vntill they beleeuinge him, came to drinke the blood, which they had shedd. And finally in another place: *Vt etiam sanguinem nossent bibere credentes, quem fuderant sauiētes;* that comminge to beleue in him, they might learne to drinke that blood, which in their cruelty they sheed. And last of all, in another place explaninge his owne faith, and the beleefe of all Christians in this behalfe, he saith against heretiks of his tyme; *Mediatorem Dei, &c.* We do with faithfull hart and mouth, receaue the mediator of God and man Christ Iesus, giuing vnto vs his flesh to be eaten, and blood to be dronken, though yt may seeme more horrible to eate mans flesh, then to stea the same, and to drinke mans blood, then to shedd the same. Consider heere the speach of Saint Augustine, whether it may agree to the eatinge of a signe of Christs body or blood; what horror is there in that? And thus much to this first argument.

2. Argument.

^a Without all quantity.
^b Not without all quantity.

- Fe-** * Bodies organically without quantity, be no bodies.
ri- * The Popes doctrine maketh the body of Christ in the Sacrament to be without quantity.

o Ergo

9. Ergo: the Popes doctrine maketh the body of Christ in the Sacrament to be no body.

Aunswere.

14. We graunt that bodyes organicall; without all quantity are no bodyes; but Catholike doctrine doth not teach, that Christs body in the Sacrament, is without all quantity, but only without externall quantity, aunswering to locall extension, and commensuration of place, which repugneth not to the nature of quantity, as before is declared at large, in the fourth obseruation of the precedent Chapter; wherby yow may see both the vanity of this argument, as also the notorious folly & ignorance of Fox, who by occasion of this argument of an organicall body vrged, by *Cranmer* in *Oxford*, against *Maister Harpesfield* when he proceeded Bachler of diuinity, bringeth in a whole commedy of vayne diuises, how all the learned Catholike men of that vniuersity, were astonished at the very propoundinge of this graue doubt, to witt; *VVhether Christ hath his quantity, quality, forme, figure, and such like properties in the Sacrament.* All the Doctors (saith Fox) fell in a buzzing, vncertaine what to aunswere, some thought one way, some another, and thus Maister Doctors could not agree. And in the margent he hath this note: *The Rabbyns could not agree amongst themselves:* and then he prosecuteth the matter for a whole columnne or page togeather, makinge

Fox pag. 1327.
Doctor

A Com-
call diuise
of Iohn
Fox.

Fox *ibid.*

Doctor Treſſam, to ſay one thinge, Doctor Smith another, Harpesfield another, VVeſton another, M. VVard philoſophy-reader another, whoſe philoſophicall diſcourſe about the nature of quantity, Fox not vnderſtandinge, neyther the other that were preſent, as he affirmeth, concludeth thus: *Maſter VVard amplified ſo largely his words, & ſo high he clymed into the heauens with Duns ladder, and not with the ſcriptures, that yt is to be maruayled, how he could come downe againe without falling.* So Iohn according to his ſkill; but Maſter VVard and the reſt, that vnderſtood philoſophy, knew well inough what he ſaid, and yow may eaſily conceaue his meaninge, as alſo the truth of the thinge yt ſelfe, by readinge my former obſeruation; for I thinke yt not conuenient to repeate the ſame againe heere.

3. Argument.

Da- All thinges which may be diuided haue quantity.

a Falſe & ri-
fooliſh.

* The body in the Popes Sacrament is diuided into three parts.

j. Ergo: the body in the Popes Sacrament hath quantity, which is againſt their owne doctrine.

Aunſwere.

15. We deny that it is againſt our doctrine, that Chriſts body in the Sacrament hath inward quantity, but only externall and locall.

W

We deny also, that Christs body is diuided into three parts in the Sacrament, or into any part at all, for it is indiuisible; only the formes of bread are diuided. And this is the ignorance of the framer of this argument, that vnderstandeth not what he saith; for it is ridiculous to affirme, that when the consecrated host is diuided into three partes, that Christs body is diuided also, which is no more true, then when a mans finger is cutt of wherein the soule was wholly before, that she is also diuided therewith.

4. Argument.

Ec- No naturall body can receaue in yt selfe at one tyme contrary or diuers qualities. *Vigil. cont. Eutich. lib. 4.*

ri- * To be in one place locall, and in another place not locall, in one place with quantity, and in another place without quantity, in one place circumscrip, in another place incircumscrip, is for a naturall body to receaue contrary qualities.

* Fasse, nor are these properly qualities.

10. Ergo: they cannot be said to be in Christs body.

Answer.

16. To the first proposition of this argument, I say, that the sentence of *Vigilius*, allea-
ged by Fox in this place, is nothinge to his purpose:

purpose: For that *Vigilius* dealinge against the heretike *Eutiches*, that would haue Christs humanity confounded with his diuinity, saith, as Fox alleageth him: *These two things are diuers, and farre vnlike, that is to say, to be conteyned in a place, and to be euery where, for the word is euery where, but the flesh is not euery-where.* Which sentence of *Vigilius* maketh against Iohn Fox his frends, and some of his Saints also the *vbiquitaries*, that hold Christs body to be euery where, as his diuinity is, of which heresie yow haue heard before * *Melancthon* to be accused by *Coliander* one of his owne sect, but Catholiks do not hold this *vbiquity* of Christs body, but that yt may be circumscribed in a certayne place, and so yt is *de facto* in heauen, though otherwise by Gods omnipotency, the same body may be and is in diuers places; which this sentence of *Vigilius* nothing impugneeth, and consequently is nothing to the purpose.

* *Supra*
mensē de-
cembri.

17. To the second or minor proposition, I say that Fox is a simple fellow, when he calleth contrary qualities to haue quantity locall and not locall, circumscrip^t and vncircumscrip^t, whereas these do appertayne to the predicaments of quantity and *ubi*, rather then to quality, and are not so contrary or opposite to themselves; but that in diuers respects they may be in one, and the selfe-same thinge, as Christ is locally in heauen, and not locally in the Sacrament; with visible and externall quantity in heauen, but with internall and inuisible in the Sacrament.

The third head or ground of Sacramentary arguments, concerning the receauinge and receauers of the Sacrament. §. 3.

18. Another company or Squadron of arguments against the reall-presence, though lesse then the former, is framed by our Sacramentaries against the reall-presence, concerning the receauers, or manner of receauinge the same. Yow shall heare them as Fox layeth them downe.

I. Argument.

Fe- **The wicked receaue not the body of Christ.**

It is denyed.

7i- **The wicked do receaue the body of Christ, yf Transubstantiation be graunted.**

And the like followeth of the reall-presence without Transubstantiation.

10n. **Ergo, Transubstantiation is not to be graunted in the Sacrament.**

Answer.

19. Do yow see a wise argument? and why leapeth Fox (thinke yow) from the reall-presence to Transubstantiation, but that he is weary of the former controuersie, for that

Transubstantiation hath a proper place very largely afterward, so as heere yt is wholly impertinent. And further, yf yow consider the matter rightly, yow will see that the same followeth as well of the reall-presence, as of Transubstantiation; for yf Christ be truly and really in the Sacrament, eyther with bread, or without bread, then whosoever receaueth the said Sacramēt, must needs receaue also Christs body. Wherefore this skipp of Fox from *reall-presence* to *Transubstantiation* was needles, and helpeth him nothinge; besides that, the whole argument is foolish; for that his *Maior* or first proposition; *that wicked men receaue not the body of Christ*, is wholly denyed by vs, and not proued by him, but presumed; and how fondly yt is done, shall appeare presently in our aunswere to his other arguments of this kind, and the whole matter is discussed more at large in our ninth precedent obseruation.

2. Argument.

*a. Truly
fructfully.*

Ca-

• To eat Christ is for a man to haue Christ dwelling and abiding in him.

Cyprian. de Cana Domini & Aug. lib. de ciuit. Dei 21. cap. 15.

*b. Fruct-
fully they
haue not.*

mes-

• The wicked haue not Christ dwelling in them.

thes.

Ergo the wicked eat not the body of Christ.

Aunswere

Answer.

20. The whole answer of this argument is sett downe more at large in our foresaid ninth obseruation, where yt is shewed, that there are three manners of receauinge Christ sacramentally only, spirituallly only, and both sacramentally and spirituallly, and that euill men do receaue him after the first manner only, that is to say, they receaue Christs true body in the Sacrament, but not the spirituall fruite therof, which *S. Paull* expresseth most cleerly, when he saith; that an euill-man, receauinge the Sacrament, *Iudicium sibi manducat, non diuini corporis Domini*, Doth eat his owne iudgement and condemnation, not discerninge, or respectinge the body of Christ which he eateth. And this is the assertion of all holy Fathers after him, to witt, that *vicked-men do eate the body of Christ but not the fruite*, and namely the two heere cited by Fox to the contrary, *S. Cyprian* and *S. Augustine* do expressely hold the same: For that *S. Cyprian* vpon these words of th' Apostle, making an intuetiue against them that receaue Christs body vnworthily, saith: *Antequam expiantur delicta, ante exhomologesin factam criminis, ante purgatam conscientiam sacrificio, & manu sacerdotis, &c.* Before their finnes be clenfed, before they haue made confession of their faults, and before their conscience be purged by the sacrifice and hand of the Priest (this was the preparation to receaue worthily,

1. Cor. 11

Cyp. serm. de lapsis.

in S. Cyprians tyme) they do presume to receaue the body of Christ. Wherof the holy Father inferred: *Spretis huius omnibus atque contemptis, vis infertur corpori eius & sanguini.* These due preparations being contemned, violence is offered by them to the body and blood of Christ, which he would neuer haue said, yf those wicked-men had not receaued the body and blood of Christ at all, as Protestants do hould.

Aug. l. cont.

Fulgent.

Donatist.

cap. 6. lib. 2.

cont. Peti-

lian. cap. 11.

& in psalm.

10. & serm.

11 de verbis

Domini &

l. de adulter.

conuic. c. 17.

& tract. 50.

in Ioan.

21. S. Augustine is frequent also and earnest in this matter: *Corpus Domini* (saith he) *& sanguis Domini, nihilominus erat illis quibus, &c.* It was no lesse the body and blood of Christ vnto those (wicked-men) to whome the Apostle said: *he that eateth vnworthily, eateth & drinketh his iudgement,* then yt was to the good. And the same Father in diuers places affirmeth, that aswell *Iudas* receaued the true body of Christ, as the rest of the Apostles, though yt were to his owne damnation: *Nam & Iudas proditor bonum corpus* (saith he) *& Symon magus bonum baptismum Christo accepit, sed quia bono bene non sunt vsi, male vtendo deleti sunt.* For that *Iudas* the Traytor also receaued the good body of Christ, and *Symon Magus* the good baptism of Christ, but for that they vsed not well that which was good, they being euill-men perished accordingly.

22. The other places cyted in the margin, I pretermitt for breuity sake to sett downe at large, this being knowne to be the generall Catholike sentence of all auncient holy Fathers, concerninge *Iudas* and other euill-men,

that

that they receaue Christ, but to their owne damnation; and the sentence of S. Paul before cyted is so cleere, and euident, as no reasonable doubt can be made therof. And when Fox doth heere alleage certayne places of S. Cyprian and S. Augustine, affirminge that the eatinge of Christ is dwellinge in him and he in vs, and that those that dwell not in him, do not eat him, yt is to be vnderstood of spirituall and fruitfull eatinge of Christs body, which agreeth only to good men and not to euill, which euill do only receaue sacramentally the body and bloud of Christ, as before we haue said, and more at large is declared in our ninth obseruation; yea the very words alleaged heere of S. Augustine by simple Iohn Fox, that discerneth not what maketh for him, & what against him, do plainly teach vs this distinction. For that S. Augustine vpon those words of Christ in S. Iohns ghospell; *he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud, dwelleth in me, and I in him*, inferreth presently these words: *Christ sheweth what yt is, not * sacramentally, but indeed to eat his body and drinke his bloud, vvhich is when a man so dwelleth in Christ, that Christ dwelleth in him.*

Aug. l. 2. v.
de Cuius. dñi
cap. 23.

Iohn. 6.

* Non Sacramentalis
sensu.

23. So he. Which words are evidently meant by S. Augustine of the fruitfull eatinge of Christs body to our Saluation, which may be said in effect the only true eatinge therof, as he may be said truly to eat and feed of his meate, that profiteth and nourisheth therby: but he that taketh no good but rather hurt by that he eateth, may be said truly and in effect not to

feed in comparison of the other that profiteth by eatinge, though he deuoure the meate sett before him; and so yt is in the blessed Sacrament, where the euill doe eat *Sacramento tenui*, as *S. Augustine* saith, that is sacramentally only, and without fruite; not that they receaue not Christs body, but that they receaue yt without fruite to their damnation; which distinction is founded in the scriptures, not only out of the place of *S. Paul* before alleaged to the *Corinthians*, but out of Christs owne words in sundry places of the ghospell, as that of

Math. 10. *S. Mathew: Venit filius hominis dare animam suam redemptionem pro multis.* The sonne of man came to giue his life for the redemption of many,

wheras indeed he gaue yt for all, but for that not all, but many should receaue fruite therby, yt is said to haue byn giuen fruitfully only for many and not all. And againe in the same Euangelist: *This is my bloud of the new Testament that shalbe shedd for many*, that is to say fruitfully, and to their saluation, but sufficiently for all, and so in like manner all men good and badd, do eate Christ in the Sacrament, but euill-men sacramentally only, without the spiritual effect therof, but good men both spiritually and sacramentally together.

24. And to this end appertayne also those words of *S. Augustine*, alleaged by *Bradford, Ridley* and others, that wicked-men *edunt panem Domini & non panem Domini*, they eat the Lords bread, but not the bread that is the Lords; that is to say, they eat not the bread, that bringeth

geth vnto them the true effect and fruite of the Lords body, which is grace, spirit, and life everlasting, though they eat the body it selfe, which is called the bread of our Lord only in this sense, that it hath no fruite nor vitall operation, but rather the contrary.

3. Argument.

- 24- Yf the wicked and infidells do receaue the body of Christ, they receaue him by sense, reason, or faith.
 24- But they receaue him neyther with sense, reason, or faith, for that the body of Christ is not sensible, nor the mystery is accordinge to reason, nor do infidells beleaue.
 24- Ergo. Wicked-men receaue in no wise the body of Christ.

Answer.

25. This argument is as wise as the maker, for first we do not alwayes ioyne wicked-men and infidels together, as he seemeth to suppose, for that an infidell (their case in receauinge being different) when he receaueth the Sacrament, not knowinge or beleeuinge yt to be the body of Christ, he receaueth yt only materially, no otherwise then doth a beast or senselesse-man, without incurring new sinne therby: wicked-men receaue yt to their damnation, for that knowinge and be-
 leeuing

leeuinge yt to be the body of Christ (or at leastwise ought to do:) they do not discern or receaue yt with the worthynesse of preparation, which they should do: and as for sense & reason, though Christs body be not sensible, yet are the formes of bread, vnder which yt is present and receaued, sensible, for that they haue their sensible tast, coulour, smell, and other like accidents, and though the mystery yt selfe stand not vpon humayne reason, yet are there many reasons both humayne and diuine, which may induce Christians to beleue the truth therof, euen accordinge to the rule of reason yt selfe, which reasons we call arguments of credibility: So as in this Sacrament, though yt stand not vpon sense or reason, yet in receauinge therof is there fraude both in sense and reason, which is sufficient to shew the vanity of him that yrgeth it: now shall we passe to the last argument of *Peter Martyr* though drawn from another ground.

4. Argument.

See this argument vrged by *Causon, Huged, and other Foxian Martyrs. pag. 1490. &c.*

Ba- The holy Chost could not come yf the body of Christ were really present, for that he saith: *Ioan. 16. vnlesse I go from you the holy ghost shall not come.*

car- But that the holy-ghost is come, yt is most certayne.

do. Ergo: yt cannot be that Christ himselfe should be heere really present.

Answered

Answer.

26. First neyther Fox, nor his Martyr can deny but that the holy-ghost was also in the world, whilst Christ was bodyly present, for that yt descended visibly vpon him in the forme of a dove, and after he gaue the same to his disciples sayinge: *accipite spiritum sanctum; receaue ye the holy-ghost; wherby is manifest, that there is no repugnance, why Christs bodyly presence may not stand togeather, with the presence of the holy-ghost. Wherefore the meaninge of those other words Ioan. 16. that except Christ departed, the holy-ghost should not come, Ioan. 16. 7. must needs be, that so long as Christ remayned vpon earth visibly, as a Doctor, teacher, & externall guide of his disciples & Church; so longe the holy-ghost should not come in such abundance of grace, to direct the Church, eyther visibly, as he did at pentecost or inuisibly, as after he did. But this impugneth nothing the presence of Christ in the Sacramēt, where he is inuisibly, & to feed our soules, not as a Doctor to teach & preach, as in his bodily conuersation vpon earth he was; for this he ascribeth to the holy-ghost after his ascension: *Ille spiritus veritatis docebit vos omnem veritatem*, that spirit of truth shall teach you all truth.*

27. And these be all the arguments of Peter Martyr registred by Fox, who concludeth in these words: *And thus briefly we haue runne ouer all the arguments, and authorities of Peter Martyr in that*

Fox pag.
225.

that disputation at Oxford with Doctor Tre-
sham, Chedsey and Morgan, before the Kings visi-
tours aboue named, anno 1549. So he. And for so
much as he setteth downe no solution vnto
these arguments; we may imagine that he
held them for insoluble: and then yf you con-
sider how weake and vayne they haue byn,
and how easy to aunswere; yow will therby
see how sure grounds, this poore Apostata-
friar Martyr had to become a sacramentary, &
to leaue his former Religion, which had en-
dured in Christs Church for so many ages be-
fore; yea and to oppose himselfe against Doctor
Luther in this point of the reall-presence, who
was their Prophet, and had first of all opened
vnto him & others the gapp to his Apostasie.
And finally what good assurance a man may
haue, to aduenture his soule with these com-
panions in such a quarrell, as Crammer, Ridley,
Latymer, Rogers, Hooper, and others did, who
hauing byn Cath. Priests for many yeares, did
first of all others imbrace in England these
new opinions of Peter Martyr, which yet were
so yonge and greene, as himselfe was scarcely
settled in them, when he first entred into that
Iland, as in his * story more particularly we
haue declared. Wherefore to leaue him, we
shall now examine some other arguments, al-
leaged by others after him, especially by those
that were actors in the former ten disputa-
tions at Oxford, Cambridge and London, which
are not much fewer in number, then these al-
leaged already of Peter Martyr.

* Mens
Decembr.

The fourth sort of arguments alleaged by others after Peter Martyr. §. 4.

8. And of these the first shalbe that of *Causan* and *Higbed*, in their confession to *B. Bonner* anno Domini 1555. The flesh profiteth nothinge (saith Christ) *Ioan. 6.* Ergo Christ hath not giuen his flesh to be eaten in the Sacrament; and diuers others do obiect the same, as a great argument; yea *Zuingliu* himselfe calleth this argument: *A brazen wall*, and a most stronge adamant, that cannot be broken. But the auncient Fathers, that knew more then *Zuingliu*, did easily breake this adamant, and brazen-wall, giuinge diuers solutions therof: as first, that yf we take these words of our Sauour to be spoken properly of his flesh; then must the sense be, that his only flesh, without his soule & diuinity, profiteth not to our saluation: and so do expound the place both *S. Augustine* and *S. Cyrill*, for that otherwise no man can deny, but that Christs flesh with his soule and diuinity, doth profit greatly euen in the Sacrament yt selfe; for that Christ in the selfe-same Chapter of *Saint Iohn* saith: *he that eateth my flesh hath life euerlasting.* Secondly, other Fathers more to the literall sense do interpret those words: (*the flesh profiteth nothinge*) not that Christs flesh doth not profit, but that the carnall vnderstandinge of that speech of Christ, about his flesh, to be eaten

First obiection.
Fox pag. 1400.

Zuingl. l. de vera & fals. Relig. cap. de Euchar.

The antiverse.

Aug. & Cyrill. in Ioan.

Ioan. 6.

ten

ren in the Sacrament (such as the Capharnaite had, whome he refuteth) profiteth not to our saluation, but requireth a more spirituall and high vnderstandinge, to witt, that yt is to be eaten in another manner vnder the formes of bread and wyne. And this is the exposition both of ^a Origen, ^b S. Cyprian, ^c S. Chrysostome, ^d Theophilact, ^e Euthimius, and others, and is the more playne and manifest sense of that place.

^a Lib. 3. in
ep. ad Rom.
cap. 4.

^b Serm. de
Cana Dom.

^c Omnes
d in hunc

^e locum
6. Ioan.

M. Guefts
argument
against the
recall pre-
sence.

Fox pag.
2252. col. 2.
num. 80.

Gen. 2.

D. Perne.

Fox pag.
1261. col. 1.
num. 8.

29. Maister Gueft (one of the Protestant op-
ponents) in the first Cambridge disputation
against Doctor Glyn, vrgeth againe and againe
this argument: That vvhich Christ tooke; he blessed
that vvhich he blessed, he brake: that vvhich he brake
he gaue: but he tooke bread: ergo he gaue bread: To
which argument Doctor Glyn answered by a like
Collection out of the scripture: That which God
tooke out of Adams side, vvas a ribbe; but what he tooke
that he brought and deliuered to Adam for his wife
ergo he deliuered him a ribbe for his wife. Which
aunsweere, though yt made the auditory to
laugh: yet Maister Perne comminge to answer
for the Protestant party, vpon the third day of
disputation, would needs yrge the same argu-
ment againe in his preface; which Maister Va-
uisour, that disputed against him, repeating pu-
blikely, gaue the like answere about the ribbe
out of Genesis: vvhewith Fox being angry
maketh this note in the margent: An vnfauour-
able comparison: perhapps for that he holdeth the
ribbe for rotten, which so longe agoe was ta-
ken out of Adams side: for that otherwise I do
not see what euill saueur Fox can find therein
but

but the effect of the aunswere stands in this: that as God tooke a ribbe, and made therof our mother Eua: so Christ tooke bread, and therof made his body, though in a different manner, the matter or substance remayninge in the one change, but not in the other.

30. The same *Guest* in the same disputation maketh this other argument against the reall-
presence. *The body of Christ is not generate, or be-
gotten in the Sacrament; ergo, yt is not in the Sacra-
ment.* Whervnto *Doctor Glyn* answered: Yow
impugne a thinge yow know not: what call
yow generation? *Guest.* Generation is the
production of accidents. *Glyn.* A new defini-
tion of a new philosopher. Thus they two,
and no one word more about this argument:
nor did *Guest* reply, either in iest or earnest, but
leapt presently to his former argumēt againe:
*That which he tooke he blessed; that which he blessed he
brake; that vrhich he brake, he gaue, &c.* Wherefore
to aunswere *Guests* obiection we say: first that
generation is *not the production of accidents*, as
secondly he affirmeth, which production of ac-
cidents appertaineth rather to alteration, aug-
mentation and locall motion, as *Aristotle* tea-
cheth, whereas generation is the production
of a substance and not of accidents: Secondly
we say that Christs body in the Sacrament is
there, not by generation nor creation, but by
another miraculous operation of God, called
Transubstantion, which is a conuersion of the
bread & wine into the true body & bloud of
Christ. And thus much in earnest to *M. Guest.*

31. After

*Guests se-
cond ar-
gument.
Fox pag.
1259.*

*Lib. primo
Generat. &
lib. 3. Phys.*

31. After Guest there commeth Maister Pilkinton, as wise as the other in matter of disputation, though afterward by the credit of his manhood therein, he gott the Bishoppricke of Durham. He began thus against Doctor Glyn. This one thing I desire of yow most worshippfull Maister Doctor, that yow will answer me with breuity as I shall propound and thus I reason:

The body of Christ that was broken on the Crosse, is a full satisfaction for the sinnes of the vvhole vvhorld.

But the Sacrament is not the satisfaction of the vvhole vvhorld.

Ergo, the Sacrament is not the body of Christ.

To this argument Doctor Glyn answered, that he vsed an equiuocation in the word *Sacrament*: for that yf the word *Sacrament* in this place, be taken for that which it conteyne the to witt the body of Christ; then is the minor proposition false; for that the body of Christ as yt was giuen on the Crosse, is the satisfaction for the world: But yf he take the Sacrament for the outward signes only of bread & wyne, then he graunteth both the conclusion and the whole sillogisme to be true, that the Sacrament is not the body of Christ. Whervnto Pilkinton maketh one only reply, and that most fondly, out of the same equiuocation sayinge: that the Sacrament hath not satisfied for the world, and that men may be saued without the Sacrament, as many were before ye was instituted: Whervnto Doctor Glyn very learnedly

learnedly answered: that yf he tooke the *Sacrament*, as before he had distinguished, for Christ conteyned in the *Sacrament*, then had the *Sacrament*, that is to say Christ therein conteyned, both satisfied for the whole world, and none were euer saved without him, for that all were saved by faith in him to come.

32. The same *Pilkinton* leaping from his former argument, without takinge his leaue, falleth vpon another *medium* in these words:

The body of Christ is resiant in heauen.

And the body of Christ is in the Sacrament.

Ergo: the Sacrament is in heauen.

*Pilkinton's
second argu-
ment.*

This argument yow see is as good and no better, then yf we should say:

The soule of a man is in the finger.

And the soule of a man is in the foote.

Ergo, the foote is in the finger.

But yet *Doctor Glyn* declared there further, after he had iested at the argument, that Christ was in one sort in heauen, and after another sort in the *Sacrament*; in heauen locally, visibly & circumscripiuely, but in the *Sacrament* inuisibly and sacramentally: which differences being not found in the soule, being in the foote and finger, maketh our argument more heard to answere, then that of *Pilkinton*.

33. There followeth a third argument of *Pilkinton* thus:

In the body of Christ there be no accidents of bread.

But in the Sacrament there be accidents of bread.

Ergo: the Sacrament is not the body of Christ.

*Pilkinton's
third argu-
ment.*

Heere yow see is the same fond equiuocation
and

and doubtfull sense of the word Sacrament before expounded, and poore Pilkinton can not gett out of yt: For yf he take the word *Sacrament*, for the only body of Christ conteyned therein, then is the minor proposition false; for that the Sacrament in this sense hath no accidents of bread in yt. But yf he take the Sacrament for externall signes, then we graunt both his minor and conclusion to be true, and nothing against vs, to witt, that the Sacrament in this sense is not the body of Christ, though comonly in our sense the Sacrament comprehendeth both the one and the other.

34. But further Maister Pilkinton had a fourth argument, & with that he was briefly dispatched: he proposed the same in these words.

*Pilkinton's
fourth argument.*

VVhersoever Christ is, there be his ministers also, so he promisseth.

*But Christ, as you hold is in the Sacrament;
Ergo: his ministers are there also:*

This argument is worthy of Maister Pilkinton and his ministers, for yt proueth by like consequence, that they should haue byn in Pilate's pallace with him, and on the Crosse. And y may be argued also, that for so much as they are not with him now in heauen, ergo: he is not there. Wherefore the meaninge of that place in S. Iohn's gospell: *VVhere I am there shall my minister be;* (he saith not *vvheresoeuer* as Maister Pilkinton putteth yt downe) is to be vnderstood of the participation of Christs glory in the next life, as him selfe expoundeth in the 17. of S. Iohn, where he saith to his Father, that he will haue the

Iohn. 12.

Iohn. 17.

able with him, to see his glory. And in the meane space we see how these fellowes, that glory so much of scripture, do abuse the true sense of scripture, in euery thinge they handle. And thus much do I find objected against the *reall-presence* in the Cambridge disputations.

35. There ensueth another disputation holden in the Conuocation-house, in the beginninge of *Q. Maryes* raigne, which in our former order or Catalogue of disputations is the seauenth; wherein Maister Phillips Deane of Rochester, did argue against the *reall-presence* in this sort.

Christ saith, *you shall haue poore people with you.*

But me you shall not haue.

Ergo, Christ is not present in the Sacrament.

Whervnto Doctor VVeston prolocutor in that conference answered, that Christ is not present in that manner of bodyly presence, as then he was, so that good people may vse works of deuotion and piety towards himselfe, as then *S. Mary Magdalen* did, in whose defence he spoke those words: But Phillips not contenting himselfe with this answer, alleaged a longe discourse out of *S. Augustine* in his commentary vpon *S. Iohns* ghospell, where the holy-father saith; that Christ is present vwith vs in Maiesie, providence, grace, and loue now, but not in corporall presence. Whervnto answered D. VVatson afterward B. of Lincolne, expoundinge that place by another of the same Father vpon the same Euangelist, where he saith: that Christ is not now present after that mortall condition, which then he was, &c. Which nothinge letteth his being after

M. Phillips
his argu-
ment.

Fox pag.
1283.

Matth. 23.
Iohn. 12.

Aug. tract.
50. in Iohn.

Tract. 70.
in Iohn.

after another manner in the Sacrament. Nay *S. Augustine* in the very same Treatise, not ten
 lynes before the words alleaged by *M. Philipps*,
Aug. ibid. hath these words: *Habes Christum praesentem, per
 altari cibum & potum.* Thou hast Christ present
 in this life, by the fodde and drinke of the Al-
 tar: which is another distinct way of presence
 from those two, named by him in the former
 place, of *grace* and *corporall conuersion*. And yet
 may seeme that this *Philipps* was not only sa-
 tisfied by this answer, for that he replied not;
 but further also was conuerted vpon this
 conference, or disputation in the contoca-
 tion-house, or very soone after: For that *Fox*
Pag. 1183. affirmeth that he continued Deane of *Rocheſter*,
in margine. all *Q. Maryes* dayes, which no doubt he should
 not haue done, yf he had not subscribed, as all
 the rest did, to this article of the *reall-presence*.

36. Next after *Philipps* Deane of *Rocheſter*, step-
 ped vp *Philpott* Archdeacon of *VVinchester*
 with great vehemency, and tooke vpon him
 to proue, that Christ in his last snpper did not
 eat his owne body by this argument: *that for so
 much as remission of sinnes was promised vnto the re-
 ceauinge of Christs body, and that Christ did not receaue
 remission of sinnes, ergo, Christ did not receaue his owne
 body.* Whervnto Maister *More-man* who, extem-
 pore was appointed to answer him, and Doctor
VVeſſon the prolocutor, gaue this answer; that
 as well he might proue that Christ was not
 baptized, for that he receaued no remission of
 sinnes therein: but as he receaued that Sacrament
 for our instruction and imitation only; so did

Fox pag.
1284. col. 2.
num. 10.

Philpotts
 first argu-
 ment.

he th
 agre
 swe
 men
 The
 haue
 reall
 such
 tor fa
 sputa
 37.
 Arch
 whic
 in th
 B. of
 ned
 turne
 and
 extar
 tyn o
 byn
 made
 leaue
 men
 of the
 ters a
 much
 ting
 may
 body
 be fa
 must
 whic
 he

he this other. Whereabout though Philpott made a great styrr, as not content with the answer; yet could he reply nothing of any moment, and so ended that dayes disputation. The next day he returned againe, and would haue made a longe declamation against the *reall presence*, but being restrayned he fell into such a rage and passion, as twise the prolocutor said, he was fitter for Bedlam, then for disputation.

37. After Philpott, stood vp Maister Cheney Archdeacon of Hereford, another of the six which did contradict the *masse* and *reall presence* in the *Conuocation-house*, who was after made B. of Glocester, being that tyme perhaps inclyned to Zuinglianisme, though afterward he turned, and became a Lutheran and so lyued and died in the late Queenes dayes. There is extant to this man an eloquent epistle in Latyn of F. Edmund Campian, who vnhappily had byn made Deacon by him, but now being made a Catholike, exhorted the Bishopp to leaue that whole ministry: This mans argument against the *reall presence*, being taken out of the common obiections of Catholike wryters and schoole-men, was this, that for so much as it is cleare by experience, that by eatinge consecrated hosts for example, a man may be nourished, and that neyther Christs body. nor the accidents and formes alone, can be said to nourish, ergo besides these two there must be some other substance, that nourisheth, which seemeth can be no other but bread:

Q

And

And the like argument may be made of consecrated wyne that also nourisheth. And further in like manner he argued, concerninge consecrated bread burned to ashes, demaunding wherof, that is to say, of what substance these ashes were made, for so much as we should no substance of bread to be therein: and Fox would make vs beleue, that all the Catholiks there present could not aunswere that doubt, and amongst others he saith of Doctor Harpesfield: Then vvas Maister Harpesfield called in to see vvhath he could say in the matter, vvhoe could a sayre tale of the omnipotency of almighty God. But Fox vnderstood not what Doctor Harpesfield said in that behalfe, as may easly appeare by his fond relatinge therof: We haue sett downe the aunswere to these and like obiections, before in the 7. and 10. Obseruations, and yt consisteth in this; that in these naturall actions, and substantiall changes of nutrition and generation, wherin not only accidents are altered, but new substances also are produced, & consequently according to nature that operation doth require not only accidents, but also substantiall matter wherof to be produced; God by his omnipotency doth supply that matter, which is necessary to the new production of that substance, eyther by nutrition or generation.

38. And albeit the vnbeleefe of heretiks doth not reach to comprehend and acknowledge, that God should do a myracle or action about nature euery tyme that this happeneth out

Fox pag.
1287. &
1288.

The aun-
swere to
M. Che-
neyes ar-
gument
about mi-
trition &
generatio.

yet c
for e
dren
God
them
day,
scoff
may
bene
ly vp
39.
out
were
Grim
Reter
tion,
Tran
thou
now
Tern
he ha
that i
I an
in cy
Tern
doth
also,
dy a
the
his v
Gribu
saying
and i

yet can they not deny yt in other things: As for example, that euery tyme, when any children are begotten throughout the world, God immediatly createth new soules for them, which needs must be thousands euery day, yet none of our sectaryes will deny or scoffe at this, or hold yt for absurd, the like may be said of all the supernaturall effectes & benefites which God bestoeth dayly & hourly vpon vs in the Sacraments or otherwise.

39. There remayne only some few places out of the Fathers to be explained, which were objected in this article, partly by Maister Grindall against Doctor Glyn, and partly also by Reser Martyr in the end of his Oxford-disputation, but related by Fox in the question of Transubstantiation, & not of the *reall-presence*, though properly they appertayne to this, as now yow will see. The first place is out of Tertullian against Marcion the heretike, where he hath these words (saith Fox): *This is my body, that is to say, this is the signe of my body.* Whervnto I answer, that Fox dealeth heere like a Fox in cytinge these words so cuttedly, for that Tertullian in this very place (as in many others) doth most effectually, not only say, but proue also, that bread is turned into Christs true body after the words of consecration; and so do the Magdeburgians affirme expressely of him: his words are these: *Christ takinge bread, and distributinge the same vnto his disciples, made yt his body; sayinge this is my body, that is the figure of my body;* and immediatly followeth: *Figura autem non*

Certaine places of Fathers explained.

Fox pag. 1250. col. 2.

Tert. lib. 4. cont. Marcion. c. 40. Magd. cont. 2. cap. 4.

fuiſſet, niſi veritatis eſſet corpus: but yt had not byn the figure of Chriſts body. yf his body had not byn a true body or truly their preſent. In which words Tertul-
lian affirmeth two things, yf yow marke him; Firſt that Chriſt made bread his true body; & then that bread had byn a figure of his body in the old Teſtament, which could not be, yf his body were not a true body, but a phantaſticall body as *Marcion* did wickedly teach: for that a phantaſticall body hath no figure. And this much for the true literall ſenſe of *Tertul-
lian* in this place; who goinge about to ſhew that Chriſt did fullfill all the figures of the old Teſtament (& conſequently was ſonne of the God of the old Teſtament, which *Marcion*iſts did deny) fullfilled alſo the figure wherein bread preſignified his true body to come, by makinge bread his body: ſayinge, this bread that was the figure of my body, in the old Teſtament, is now my true body in the new, and ſo doth the truth ſucceed the figure. And this to be the true literall ſenſe and ſcope of *Tertul-
lian* in this place (as before I haue ſaid) eue-
ry man may ſee plainly, that will read the place.

40. The other places are taken out of diuers other Fathers, who ſome tymes do call the Sacrament, a figure or ſigne, representation, or ſimilitude of Chriſts body, death, paſſion, & bloud, as *S. Auguſtine* in *Psalm. 2.* Chriſt gaue a figure of his body, and *lib. cont. Adamant. cap. 12.* he did not doubt to ſay this is my body, when he gaue a figure of his body. And *S. Hierome*: Chriſt repreſented

into vs his body. And S. Ambrose lib. 4. de Sacram.
cap. 4. As thou hast receaued the similitude of his death,
so drinkest thou the similitude of his pretious blood:
These places I say, and some other the like,
that may be obiected, are to be vnderstood in
the like sense, as those places of Saint Paul are,
wherin Christ is called by him a figure, *Figura*
substantia Patris: A figure of the substance of his
Father. Heb. 1. And againe; *Imago Dei*. An Image
of God. Coloss. 1. And further yet; *Habitu inuen-*
tus vt homo. Appearinge in the likenes of a man.
Philipp. 2. All which places, as they do not take
from Christ, that he was the true substance of
his Father or true God, or true man in deed
(though out of euery one of these places some
particular heresies haue byn framed by aun-
cient heretiks, against his diuinity or humani-
ty) so do not the forsaide phrases, sometymes
vsed by the auncient Fathers, callinge the Sa-
crament a figure, signe, representation or si-
militude of Christs body, exclude the truth or
reality therof, for that there is as well, *signum*
& figura rei presentis quam absentis, A signe or fi-
gure of things present, as well as of things ab-
sent, as for an example, a firkyn of wyne han-
ged vp for a signe at a Tauerne dore, that there
is wyne to be sould, is both a sygne of wyne,
and yer conteyneth and exhibiterth the thinge
yt selfe: And so yt is in the Sacrament, which
by his nature being a signe, figure, or represen-
tation, doth both represent and exhibite, si-
gnifieth and conteyneth the body of our Sa-
uiour.

ould he-
retikes
haue fra-
med some
particular
heresies
out of the
Fathers
by their
misvnder-
standinge
their
meaning:

41. And as it should be an hereticall cauill to argue out of the said places of S. Paul, as the old heretiks did, that Christ is called a *figure of the substance of his Father, and the Image of God, or the similitude of man*: ergo, he is not of the reall substance with his Father, nor really God, nor truly man: so is it as hereticall to argue as our Sacramentaries do; that *Tertullian, Augustine, & some other Fathers* do sometymes call the Sacrament a *similitude, figure, signe or remembrance* of Christs body, his death and passion, as in deed yt is; (for that otherwise yt should not be a Sacrament) ergo: yt is not his true body, that is conteyned therin, especially seing the same Fathers, do in the selfe-same places, whence these obiections are deduced, expressly & cleerly expound themselves, affirming Christs true reall body to be in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wyne: as for example *Saint Ambrose* licete objected in the fourth booke *de Sacramentis cap. 4.* doth expressly and at large proue the *reall-presence*, as exactly as any Catholike can wryte at this day: sayinge: *that before the words of consecration, yt is bread, but after yt is the body of Christ.* And againe.

*Ambro. l. 4.
de Sacram.
cap. 4.*

*S. Ambrose
expoundeth him-
selfe a-
gainst the
Protestants.*

Before the words of Christ be vttered, the chalice is full of vyne and water, but when the words of Christ haue wrought their effect, then is made that bloud which redeemed the people. And yet further. *Christ Iesu doth testifie vnto vs, that we receaue his body & bloud, and shall we doubt of his testimony?* Which words being so plaine and euident for the truth of Catholike beleefe, lett the reader consider,

how

how vaine and fond a thing yt is for the Protestants to obiekt out of the selfe-same place, that we receaue the similitude of his death, and drinke the similitude of his pretious blood, for that we deny not, but the body of Christ in the Sacrament is a representation and similitude of his death on the Crosse, and that the blood which we drinke in the Sacrament, vnder the forme of wine, is a representation and similitude of the shedding of Christs blood in his passion. But this letteth not, but that it is the selfe-same body & blood, though yt be receaued in a different manner, as it letteth not, but that Christ is true God, though he be said, to be the Image of God, as before yow haue heard.

42. There remaineth then only to be answered, that speech of *S. Augustine* obiekted in these disputations. *Quid parat dentes & ventrem? crede & manducasti.* Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? beleue and thou hast eaten. Whervnto I answered, that this speech of *S. Augustine* and some other like, that are found in him, and some other Fathers, of the spirituell eatinge of Christ by faith, do not exclude the *reall. presence*, as we haue shewed before in our ninth obseruation. It is spoken against them, that come with a base and grosse imagination to receaue this diuine foode, as if yt were a corporall refection, and not spirituell; whereas indeed faith & charity are those vertues, that giue the life vnto this eatinge: faith in beleeuinge Christs words to be true, as *S. Ambrose* in the place before cyted faith, and

*Aug. tract.
15. in loan.*

41. And as it should be an hereticall cauill to argue out of the said places of *S. Paul*, as the old heretiks did, that Christ is called a figure of the substance of his Father, and the Image of God, or the similitude of man: ergo, he is not of the reall substance with his Father, nor really God, nor truly man: so is it as hereticall to argue as our Sacramentaries do; that *Tertullian*, *Augustine*, & some other Fathers do sometymes call the Sacrament a similitude, figure, signe or remembrance of Christs body, his death and passion, as in deed yt is; (for that otherwise yt should not be a Sacrament) ergo: yt is not his true body, that is conteyned therein, especially seing the same Fathers, do in the selfe-same places, whence these obiections are deduced, expressly & clearly expound themselves, affirming Christs true reall body to be in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wyne: as for example *Saint Ambrose* heere objected in the fourth booke de Sacramentis cap. 4. doth expressly and at large proue the reall-presence, as exactly as any Catholike can wryte at this day; sayinge: that before the words of consecration, yt is bread, but after yt is the body of Christ. And againe.

*Ambr. l. 4.
de Sacram.
cap. 4.*

*S. Ambrose
expoundeth him-
selfe a-
gainst the
Protestants.*

Before the words of Christ be vttered, the chalice is full of vyne and water, but when the words of Christ haue wrought their effect, then is made that bloud which redeemed the people. And yet further. Christ Iesu doth testifie vnto vs, that we receaue his body & bloud, and shall we doubt of his testimony? Which words being so plaine and euident for the truth of Catholike beleefe, lett the reader consider,

how

how vaine and fond a thing yt is for the Protestants to obiekt out of the selfe-same place, that we receaue the similitude of his death, and drinke the similitude of his pretious blood, for that we deny not, but the body of Christ in the Sacrament is a representation and similitude of his death on the Crosse, and that the blood which we drinke in the Sacrament, vnder the forme of wine, is a representation and similitude of the shedding of Christs blood in his passion. But this letteth not, but that it is the selfe-same body & blood, though yt be receaued in a different manner, as it letteth not, but that Christ is true God, though he be said, to be the Image of God, as before yow haue heard.

42. There remayneth then only to be answered, that speech of *S. Augustine* obiekted in these disputations. *Quid parat dentes & ventrem? crede & manducaſti*: Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? beleeue and thou hast eaten. Whervnto I answere, that this speech of *S. Augustine* and some other like, that are found in him, and some other Fathers, of the spirituall eatinge of Christ by faith, do not exclude the reall. presence, as we haue shewed before in our nynth obseruation. It is spoken against them, that come with a base and grosse imagination to receaue this diuine foode, as if yt were a corporall refection, and not spirituall; whereas indeed faith & charity are those vertues, that giue the life vnto this eatinge: faith in beleeuinge Christs words to be true, as *S. Ambrose* in the place before cyted saith, and

*Aug. tract.
25. in Ioan.*

and therby assuringe our selues, Christs true body to be there: and charity in preparing our selues worthily, by examinations of our conscience, that we do not receaue our owne damnation, as *S. Paul* doth threat. And this is the true spirituall eatinge of Christs body by faith, but yet truly and really, as the said Fathers do expound vnto vs, whose sentences more at large yow shall see examined in the Chapter followinge.

The conclusion of this chapter.

43. These then being all in effect, or at least wayes the most principall arguments, that I find obiected by our English *Sacramentaryes* in the forsaide ten disputations, against the article of Christs true & reall being in the *Sacrament*, you may consider with admiration and pittie, how feeble grounds those vnfortunate men had, that vvere first dealers in that affaire, wheron to change their faith and religion, from that of the Christian world, from tyme out of mynd before them: and to enter into a new sect and labyrinth of opinions contradicted amonge themselves, and accursed by him that was their first guide to lead them into new pathes, to witt, *Luther* himselfe, and yet to stand so obstinately & with such immoueable pertinacy therin; as to offer their bodies to temporall fire, and their soules to the euident perill of eternall damnation for the same; but this is the ordinary enchauntement of heresie founded on pride, selfe iudgement, and selfe-will; as both by holy scriptures and auncient Fathers we are admonished.

44. One thing also is greatly heere to be noted by the carefull reader, vpon consideration of these arguments to and fro, how vncertayne a thing yt is for particular men, whether learned or vnlearned (but especially the ignorant) to ground themselues & their faith vpon their owne or other mens disputations, which with euery little shew of reason to and fro, may alter theire iudgement or apprehension, and in how miserable a case Christian men were, yf their faith (wherof dependeth their saluation or damnation) should hange vpon such vncertayne meanes as these are, & that God had left no other more sure or certaine way then this for men to be resolued of the truth, as we see he hath, by his visible Church, that cannot erre; yet thought we good to examine this way of disputatiō also, and the arguments therof vsed by Protestants against the truth. But now followeth a larger & more important examen, of the Catholike arguments alleaged by our men against them, in this article of the *reall-presence*. And what kind of aunswers they framed to the same, wherby thou wilt be greatly confirmed (good reader) yf I be not much deceaued, in the opinion of their weaknesse, and vntruth of their cause.

The miserable case of sectaries, without any sure ground to lean vnto.

W H A T

WHAT CATHOLIKE ARGUMENTS

*Were alleaged in these disputations for
the reall-presence; and how they
were answered or shifted of
by the Protestants.*

CHAP. V.

As I haue briefly touched in the former Chapter, the reasons and arguments alleaged for the Sacramentary opinions, against the reall-presence; so now I do not deeme yt amisse, to runne ouer in like manner, some of the Catholike arguments that were alleaged against them, though neyther tyme nor place will permitt to recyte them all, which the discreett reader may easily imagine by the grounds and heads therof, sett downe in the second Chapter of this Treatise, though many & waighty they were or might be. Wherefore to speake breifely somewhat therof, and for more breuity and perspicuity, to draw the matter to some kind of order and methode: yow must note, that of these ten disputations, only foure were in tyme of Catholike gouernement, as before I signified, that is to say; the six-dayes conference in the *Conuocation-house,*

house, in the beginnunge of Q. Maryes raigne, & the three-dayes seuerall disputation at Oxford with *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latymer*, some monethes after. And as for the first in the Conuocation-house, the Protestants only did dispute, for three continuall dayes togeather, to witt, *Phillips*, *Haddon*, *Cheyney*, *Elmour*, and *Philpott*, and seuerall Catholike men were appointed to aunswere them. And when in the end the Protestants were required to aunswere according to promise, in their turnes, the Catholike opponents for other three dayes, they refused yt all, sauing *Philpott*, vpon certayne conditions to be heard yet further, but Doctor *VVeston* the prolocutor reiected him, as a man fitter to be sent to bedlam (saith Fox) then to be admitted to disputation, &c. For that he both was vnlearned, and a very madd man in deed. Wherefore out of this disputation, little or nothings is offered about this article of reall-presence, for that the Catholike party disputed not at all.

2. And as for the other three dayes disputation in Oxford, the last, which was with *Latymer*, was very little, for that he fledd disputation, as there yow shall see; and the few arguments that were made against him, were rather in proosse of the sacrifice of the masse: so as most arguments were alleaged in the former two-dayes conflict against *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, which presently we shall examine, though vnder K. Edward also, one day of the Cambridge disputations was allowed to Catholike opponents, to propose their argumets.

Doctor

Disputation in the conuocation-house.

Fox pag. 1227. col. 2. mm. 30.

Philpott.

Doctor Madew being defendant for the Protestants, and Doctor Glyn, Maister Langdall, & Maister Sedg-wicke opponents for the Catholiks: to as out of these foure disputations, we shall note breifely some Catholike arguments, that were alleaged, aduertisinge the reader first to consider with some attention the points ensuinge.

First
point to
be obser-
ned.

3. First that we haue nothinge of these disputations, their arguments or aunswers, but only such as please Iohn Fox to deliuer and impart with vs, which most evidently do appeare to be mangled and vnperfect in many places, without head or foote, coherence or consequence, which must proceed eyther of purpose to make matters obscure, and thereby to bring the reader into doubt and confusion, or of lacke of good information; and that the former is more credible then the second, may be ghesse'd by the variety of impertinent notes in the margent, scoffes, and iests in the text yf selfe, often tymes putt in to deface the Catholike party, and to giue credit to his sectaryes: And consequently what faith may be giuen to his narrations (but only where they make against himselfe) is easy to be seene, especially in that himselfe cōfesseth, that Ridley wrote in prison his owne disputations after they were past, & the same we may presume of the rest, and then no man can doubt, but that they would putt downe their owne parts to their vttermost aduantage, or at least-wise with the smallest losse, that they could diuise.

4. Secondly yt is to be considered of the precedent reader, that must aduenture his soule euerlastingly by takinge one part or other in this controuersie heere in hand, how much yt may import him to stand attent to the places and authorities, alleaged out of scriptures & Fathers for the truth, & to consider them well, reading them ouer againe, and againe & weighing the true meaning & sense of the wryter, and not how sleightly or cunningly they are, or may be shifted of by any witty wrangler, for so much as this may be done with any wrytinge or euidence neuer so manifest, yf the defendant will list to cauill, & the reader be so inconsiderate or carelesse of his owne perill, as to be delighted or abused therewith.

The second point to be obserued.

5. Thirdly in the allegation of Fathers testimonyes, which heere are to ensue, yt is to be weighed, not only what they say, but also how they say, what phrases and speeches they vse, and to what end, and whether yf they had byn of the Protestants Religion, they would haue vsed those phrases or no, more then Protestant wryters do themselues at this day, especially so ordinarily and commonly as the said Fathers do, they being men both learned, wise, and religious, that well knew how to vtter their owne mynds & meaning, what is proper & improper speech, & withall not being ignorant, how great inconueniences must ensue of improper speeches in matters of faith, where men are bound to speake precisely

The third point considerable.

cisely and warily: and on the other side is to be considered also, yf they were of contrary opinions to the Protestants, and of that faith which we affirme them to be in this point of the *reall presence*, what more effectuall speeches could they haue vsed to expresse yt, then they do, callinge yt *the true body, the reall body, the naturall body of our Saviour, the same body that he tooke of the blessed Virgin, and gaue vpon the Crosse, the body wherby he is vnited vnto vs in humanity*; and denyinge it expressely to be bread after the vvords of consecration, though yt seeme to be bread to our eyes & tast, and that we must not trust our senses therein, but yeld to Gods omnipotency, and beleeeue, that as he hath vvrought infinite other miracles, so hath he done this, that we must adore yt, vvith the highest adoration; and other like phrases, which neyther Protestants can abide, or euer do vse in their wrytinges; nor could the Fathers, yf they had byn expressely of our Religion (as we say they were) diuise words more significant, proper, or effectuall to expresse the truth of our Catholike faith, then yf of purpose they had studied for yt, as no doubt they did; So as yf the ancient Fathers did vnderstand what they spake, and that they spake as they meant; then are the Protestants in a pittifull plight, whose saluation or damnation dependeth in this, whether we must vnderstand them, *S. Paul*, and Christ himselfe literally, as they spake, or by a figure only; so as yf they vsed no figures, then is the Sacramentary opinion to be held for heresie.

6. Fourthly is to be considered also in this matter, as elf-where we haue noted, that when any one of these auncient Fathers, in what age soeuer, is found to vse these effectuall words, for vttering his meaning about this high mystery of Christs being present in the Sacrament, he is to be vnderstood to expresse not only his owne iudgement, and beleeefe therin, but the iudgement also and beleeefe of the whole Church of Christendome in that age, for so much as any Doctor, neither then nor after, did note him for error, or temerity in speakinge & wrytinge as he did, which no doubt would haue happened, as in all other occasions of errors or heresies yt did, yf his speach had bin vnfound, vnproper, or dangerous; so as when we find but one Father vncontroulled in these assertions, we are iustly to presume, that we heare the whole age and Christian Church of his tyme speake together, and much more when we see diuers Fathers agree in the selfe-same manner of speach, and vttering their meaninge. And whosoeter is carefull of his soule in these dangerous tymes of controuerfies, ought to be mindfull of this obseruation, and so shall we passe to the disputations themselves.

The 4th point of note.

R

Out

Out of the first Cambridge-disputation in K. Edvvardes dayes, wherein the defendantes were D. Madevv, and B. Ridley highe Comissioner. 20. Iunij. 1549. §. 1.

7. Albeit in this disputation matters were but sleightly handled, and no argument vrged to any important issue, by reason of the often interruptions of the Cambridge-proctors and sleights vsed by Ridley himseife; yet do I finde that Doctor Glyn, being a very learned man indeed, did touch diuers matters of moment, though he prosecuted not the same, yf Fox his relation be true, and much lesse receaued he any substantiall solution therof. As for example, in the beginnunge he made a very effectuall discourse how this diuine Sacrament conteyninge Christs reall body, was not only prefigured by diuers figures in the old Testament, as namely the Paschall-lambe, the *manna* and *shew-bread* (which signified the great importance and moment therof when yt shoulde be performed) but also was so peculiarly and diligently promised by our Sauour, in the six of S. Iohn, comparinge yt with the said figures and shewing how much yt was to exceed the same, and namely the *manna* that came from heauen, and finally expoundinge yt to be his

D. Glynne
his first
discourse.

owne

owne flesh which he would giue vs to eate in
fullfillinge those figures: *Panis quem ego dabo ca-*
ro mea est, the bread that I will giue you shalbe
my flesh, and that truly and indeed: *caro enim*
mea verè est cibus; for my flesh is truly meate, &c.
8. This promise then, and this prefiguration
was not (quoth he) performed by Christ, but
in his last supper when he tooke bread and de-
liuered it sayinge: *this is my body*: which perfor-
mance, yf yt must aunswere eyther to Christs
promise in the ghospell, or to the figures in
the old Testament, must needs be more then
bread, for that otherwise yt should not be
better then the *manna*, that was bread from
heauen, which Christ in *S. Iohns* ghospell ex-
pressely promised, should be changed into his
flesh. And yf Christ in his last supper, had but
giuen a figure of his true body; then had he
fullfilled the figures of th^e old Testament with
a figure in the new, and so all had byn figures
contrary to that of *S. Iohn*: *Lex per Moysen data*
est, veritas autem per Iesum Christum facta est. The
law was giuen by Moyses (in figures) but
the truth thereof was performed by Iesus
Christ, &c.

Iohn. 6.

Ibidem.

Iohn. 1.

9. Thus began Doctor Glyn, but I find no so-
lution giuen therunto, but that Doctor Madew
being asked whether the Sacraments of the
old law, and new were all one? he said: *yea in*
deed & effect: Doctor Glyn inferred, that then they
were not inferiour to vs; for that they had
bread that signified Christs body as well as
ours, and they by eating that bread with faith

The
leaves
equall to
vs by the
sacramen-
tary do-
ctrine.

In Christ to come, did eat Christs body, and participate his grace therby, no lesse then we, which is a great absurdity, and contrary to the whole drift of *S. Paul* speaking of that matter, and extolling the dignity of this Sacrament, yea cōtrary to the expresse discourse of Christ himselfe, sayinge: *not Moyses gaue yow bread from heauen* (meaning the Manna) *but my Father giueth yow true bread from heauen.* And to this discourse also yow shall find nothings answered in effect.

Joan. 6.

*Fox pag.
1253.*

*Adoratiō
of the Sa-
crament.*

10. From this *Doctor Glyn* passeth to shew out of *S. Augustine*, *S. Ambrose*, and *S. Basill*, that the body of Christ must be adored before yt be receaued; whervnto was aunswered: that only a certayne reuerent manner of receauinge was therby meant, but no adoration; but the other replied, that the Fathers spake of proper adoration; yea *S. Austen* went so farre therein in his books *De ciuitate Dei*, that he affirmeth the heathens to haue esteemed the Christians, to haue adored *Ceres* and *Bacchus*, Gods of bread and wyne, by the adoration which they vsed to this Sacrament of bread and wyne, which they would neuer haue suspected of the Protestants, by their behauiour towards their supper of bread and wyne. Whervnto another aunswere was framed, that *Saint Augustine* meant only of adoringe Christs body in heauen. and not in the Sacrament; and this aunswere was confirmed by *Ridley* very sollemnely, sayinge for his preface: *For because I am one that doth loue the truth, I vwill heere declare vwhat*

I think

I thinke in this point, &c. I do graunt a certayne honour and adoration to be done vnto Christs body, but when the Fathers speake not of yt in the Sacrament, but of yt in heauen, &c. Neyther is there any other aunswere giuen. And yet who seeth not, that this is but a playne thife? For when S. Augustine for example saith: *Nemo illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adorauerit*: No man eateth that flesh (in the Sacrament) but first adoreth yt. And Saint Chrysostoms: *Adora & communica, dum proferatur sacrificium*, adore and communicate, whilst the sacrifice is brought forth; yt is euident by common sense, that the adoration is appointed to that body, which there presently is eaten, and not to Christs body absent in heauen; for by this kind of their adoration, we adore also our ordinary dinners, to witt by adoringe God in heauen, and sayinge grace, &c. And he that shall read the place of the Fathers themselves, will wonder at this impudency, for Saint Austen doth expound those words of the Psalme *Adorate scabellum pedum eius*, and applieth yt to his flesh in the Sacrament, and S. Chrysostome speaketh expressly of Christs flesh, as yt is in the Sacrament, and offered as a sacrifice.

Aug. in
Psalm. 98.

Chrysost.
hom. 60. ad
Pop. Antioch.

Psalm. 98.

And yet doth Fox make Doctor Glyn to haue replied neuer a word, nor so much as produced the textes themselves of the Fathers named by him, but giuinge yt ouer passed to another argument, sayinge: If yt please your good Lordshipp, S. Ambrose and S. Augustine do say, that before the consecration yt is but bread, and after the con-

*S. Ambrose
and S. Au-
sten hand-
somely
shifted of.*

secration yt is called the body of Christ, Wherto was answered: Indeed yt is the very body of Christ sacramentally after the consecration, vvhervas before yt is nothinge but common bread, and yet after that yt is the Lords bread, and thus must *S. Ambrose* and *S. Augustine* be vnderstood. So said the aunswerers, and Doctor *Glyn* vvas by the procters commaunded to cease, and palle to the second question; but he obtayned by intreaty to go foreward an instance or two more, shewing out of the words of *S. Ambrose*, that *Ridleyes* aunswere could not be true; for that *S. Ambrose* said; that after the consecration, there is not the thinge that nature did forme, but that which the blessing doth consecrate. And that yf the benediction of *Elias* the Prophett, could turne the nature of water, how much more the benediction of Christ, God & man can do the same, ergo there is a greater change in the natures then of common bread, to become the Lords bread.

*D. Glyn
repley.*

*Fox pag.
1254.*

12. To this reply there was no other aunswere giuen, but that *S. Ambrose* his booke de *Sacramentu* was not his, & *Ridley* affirmed that all the Fathers did say so: which was a shamelesse lye in so great an auditory, nor could he bringe forth so much as one Father that said so, nor alleaged he any one argument to proue yt to be so; and yf he had, yet *S. Ambrose* repeatinge againe the very same sentence in his booke de *iniciandis* is sufficient for the authority of the place, but *Glyn* is made to passe away the matter with sylence, sayinge: *Vvell lett this passe, &c.* And then goinge to other authorities

eyes
as w
offici
the b
in the
of G
ture i
licy, a
and n
that l
but in
etc. A
throw
affirm
the fl
ergo y
licity,
Christ
stand
he mu
and e
that s
13. I
brose, a
virgin
of God
and we
grace a
Sacr
dersta
to the
S. Cyp
tency

ryes

eyes of Fathers, ys wyped of with like shifcs; as when he cyteth S. Cyprians words: *Pani non efficit, sed natura mutata, omnipotentia Dei fit caro:* the bread by consecration being changed not in shape, but in nature, is by the omnipotency of God made flesh; they aunswere that by nature is vnderstood a naturall property or quality, and by flesh, a fleshly thinge or quality, and not the substance, so as the sense must be, that bread is changed not in outward shape, but into a naturall property of a fleshly thing, &c. And when Doctor Glyn replied to ouerthrow this inuention out of S. Ambrose, who affirmeth this chage of bread to be made into the flesh, that was taken of the Virgin Mary, ergo yt was not only into a fleshly thinge, quality, or property, but into the true flesh of Christ; Ridly gaue an aunswere, that I vnderstand not, nor himsele I thinke, but only that he must say somewhat in so great an audience, and expectation; or Fox vnderstood yt not that setteth it downe: for these are his words:
 13. VVhen Doctor Glyn vrged the sayinge of S. Ambrose, that bread is changed into the body taken from the virgin Mary, that is to say (saith he) that by the word of God, the thinge hath a being that yt had not before, and we do consecrate the body, that we may receaue the grace and power of the body of Christ in heauen by this Sacramentall body. So he. And doth any man vnderstand him? or is his aunswere any thinge to the purpose for satisfyinge the Fathers? S. Cyprian saith: that the bread by the omnipotency of God is changed in nature, and made

A strange
 shittinge
 of the au-
 thorities
 of Fa-
 thers.

Fox pag.
 1154 col. 2.
 num. 3.

flesh and *S. Ambrose* saith: *yt is the flesh taken from the Virgin*; and *Ridley* saith heere; *that yt hath a being, vvhich yt had not before, and that, they do consecrate a sacramentall body of Christ, therby to receaue the grace and power of Christs body in heauen*; but howsoever they do consecrate that body: (which is a strange word for Sacramentaryes to vse) yet do they graunt that this Sacramentall body is but bread; and how then can yt be flesh, and flesh of the Virgin; were not the Fathers ridiculous, yf they vsed these equiuocations, yea false and improper speeches?

Fox pag.
324.

S. Chrysostome testified of.

14. Well Doctor *Glyn* goeth foreward, and alleageth *S. Chrysostome* vpon *S. Mathewes* gospel, where to persuaide vs the truth of Christs body in the Sacrament, he saith: *that we must beleue Christs words in these mysteres, and not our senses, for that our senses may be deceaued; but Christ sayinge this is my body cannot deceaue vs; and that he made vs one body with himselfe, not through faith only, but in very deed: and further, that the miracle which he wrought in his last supper, he vworketh daily by his ministers, &c.* Whervnto *Ridley* answered nothing but these words: *Maister Doctor, you must vnderstand, that in that place S. Chrysostome shewed, that Christ deliuered vnto vs no sensible thinge in that supper.* So he. Which notwithstanding is evidently false, for he deliuered sensible bread & wyne, according to the Protestants faith, and accordinge to out, the formes of bread and wyne, which are also sensible: and yf there were no sensible thinge, then could there be no Sacrament, which must conteyne a sensible

visible signe. And to refute this shift of Ridley,
 Doctor Glyn objected Theophilact, expoundinge
 S. Chrysostome, and vsinge the same words that
 he did, to witt, that the bread is transelemented,
 and transformed. He alleageth another place or
 two of S. Augustine together with S. Irenaeus: *Math. 11.*
 To all which Rochester aunswereth resolutely:
I Vell say what you list; yt is but a figuratiue speech, as
S. Iohn Baptift was said to be Elias for a property, &c.
 But who doth not see the absurdity of this
 euasion; for so much as the meaning of Christ,
 about Elias his spiritt in S. Iohn Baptift, is eui-
 dent, nor euer went any auncient Fathers
 about to affirme or proue by arguments, that
 S. Iohn Baptift was truly Elias in person (him- *Iohn. 1.*
 selfe expressly denyinge yt) or that yt was
 meant literally, as they do of the words of
 Christ in the Sacrament: And this could not
 Ridley but see, but that he was blinded in pride
 and passion, for that otherwise he would ne-
 uer haue gone about to aunswere the Fathers
 by euident wrangling; so contrary to their
 owne sense and meanings.

15. After Doctor Glyn was putt to silence in *Langdale*
 this order, succeded Maister Langdale, Maister *disputeth*
 Sedgewicke and Maister Tonge, but very breefely
 concerninge this article of the reall-presence,
 not being permitted to speake more, and the
 most part of the tyme trifled out also, with
 courtesyes of speech, the one to the other; My
 good Lord; good Maister Doctor; pleaseth yt your good
 Lordshipp; liketh yt your good Fathershipp; honourable
 Father, and the like ceremonyes, for they durst
 do

Fox pag.
1256. col. 1.
num. 43.

Fox *ibid.*

do no other, Ridley being then high commisionar; yet Maister Langdale vrged a place of S. Chrysostome, where he bringeth Christ, sayinge these words: *I would be your brother, I tooke vpon me common flesh and bloud for your sakes; and euen by the same things that I am ioyned to you, the very same I haue exhibited to you againe;* meaninge in the Sacrament. Wherof Maister Langdale inferred, that seing Christ tooke vpon him true naturall flesh, and not a figure of flesh only, or remembrance therof, therefore he gaue vs his true naturall flesh like man in the Sacrament, and not a figure. Wherto Ridley aunswereth in these words and no more: *VVe are not ioyned by naturall flesh; but do receaue his flesh spiritually from aboue.* Which aunswere is not only contrary to the expresse words and meaning of S. Chrysostome in this place, but of Christ himselfe also brought in heere by S. Chrysostome to vtter his meaninge, as you haue heard. *I tooke vpon me common flesh for your sakes; and by the same things that I am ioyned to you, the very same I haue exhibited vnto you againe.* Where you see that he saith, he gaue the very same in the Sacrament, which he had taken vpon him for our sakes, and that by the same he was ioyned to vs againe; and now Maister Ridley saith; *that vve are not ioyned to him by naturall flesh.* These be contraryes, which of two shall we beleue? Christ, and S. Chrysostome expoundinge him, or Ridley against them both?

28. Sedge-
wicke his
disputa-
tion.

16. Maister Sedge-wicke disputed next, but hath not halfe a columnne or page allowed to the settinge

fettin
he vr
out o
the A
gure
figure
body
in the
aunsw
his w
graunt
of the
really
taine r
these
the tru
he is El
in prop
And r
mine
graunt
of Ch
be in
his fle
cond
consec
that a
but on
dy, as
his ow
no rea
militu
people

settinge downe of his whole disputation; yet he vringe diuers reasons in that little tyme out of the scriptures, why the Sacrament of the Altar cannot be in the new law by a figure, but must needs be the fullfillinge of old figures, and consequently the true and reall body of Christ; he brought *Maister Ridley* within the compasse of a dozen lines, to giue two aunswers one plaine contrary to another, as his words do import: for this is the first: *I do graunt yt to be Christs true body and flesh, by a property of the nature assumed to the God-head, and we do really eate and drinke his flesh and bloud, after a certaine reall property.* His second aunswere is in these words: *It is nothinge but a figure or token of the true body of Christ, as it is said of S. Iohn Baptist, he is Elias, not that he vvas so indeed or in person, but in property and vertue he represented Elias.* So he, And now lett any man with iudgement examine these two aunswers: For in the first he graunth at least wayes a true reall property of Christs flesh, assumed to his Godhead, to be in their bread, wherby we do really eate his flesh, and drinke his bloud. And in the second he saith, yt is nothinge but a figure, and consequently excludeth all reall property; for that a figure hath no reallity or reall property, but only representeth and is a token of the body, as himselfe saith; which is euident also by his owne example, for that *S. Iohn Baptist* had no reall property of *Elias* in him, but only a similitude of his spiritt and vertue. And so these people, whilst they would seeme to say somewhat,

M. Ridley
his owne
contradi-
ction.

For *bid;*

what, do speake contradictories amonge themselves.

M. Tonge
disputa-
tion.

17. There followed *Maister Tonge*, who as breefly as the other, touched some few places of the Fathers (though they be not quoted) where they say that our bodies are nourished in the Sacrament by Christs flesh, and that truly we drinke his blood therein, and that for auoyding the horror of drinking mans blood, Christ had condescended to our infirmities, and giuen yt to vs vnder the formes of wyne, and other like speeches, which in any reasonable mans sense, must needs import more then a figure of his body and blood, or a spirituall being there only by grace, for so much as by grace he is also in Baptisme and other Sacraments: & finally he vrged againe the place of *S. Cyprian*: *That the bread being changed not in shape but in nature, vvas by the omnipotency of the vword, made flesh.* Wherto *Ridley* aunswered againe in these words: *Cyprian there doth take this vword nature for a property of nature, and not for the naturall substance.* To which euasion *Maister Tonge* replyeth: *this is a strange acception, that I haue not read in any authors before this tyme.* And so with this he was glad to giue ouer (saith *Fox*) and askinge pardon for that he had done, said: *I am contented, and do most humbly beseech your good Lordshipp to pardon me of my great rudenesse, &c.* Belike this rudenesse was for that he had said, that yt was a strange acception of *S. Cyprians* words, to take *change in nature*, for *change into a property of nature*, and *flesh for a fleshly thinge*

or

or quality, as before yow haue heard, and that
this should aunswere S. Cyprians intention: for
lett vs heare the application: Bread (in the Sa-
crament) being changed not in shape but in nature
(saith S. Cyprian) by the omnipotency of the word is
made flesh; that is to say, as Ridley will haue yt
bread, being changed not in shape, but in a property of
nature, is made a fleshely thinge, or fleshely quality:
What is this? or what sense can it haue? what
property of fleshely nature doth your commu-
nion bread receaue? or what reall property of
bread doth it leese by this change mencyoned
by S. Cyprian? We say, (to witt S. Cyprian) that
our bread retayning the outward shape, doth
leese his naturall substance, and becommeth
Christs flesh, what naturall property of bread
doth yours leese? And againe. What fleshely
thinge or quality doth yt receaue by the om-
nipotency of the word in consecration? And
is not this ridiculous, or doth Ridley vnder-
stand this his riddle? But lett vs passe to the
next disputation vnder Q. Mary, where we
shall see matters handled otherwise, and argu-
ments followed to better effect and issue.

The con-
futation
of Master
Ridleyes
equation a-
bout Saint
Cyprian.

Our

Out of the first Oxford-disputation in
the beginninge of Q Maryes raigne,
wherin D. Cranmer, late Archbi-
shopp of Canterbury, was defendant
for the Protestant party, Upon the
16. of Aprill anno 1554. §. 2.

18. When as the Doctors were sett in the
diuinity schoole, and foure appointed, to be
exceptores argumentorum (saith Fox) sett at a
Table in the middelt therof, togeather with
foure other notaryes sittinge with them, and
certayne other appointed for iudges (another
manner of indifferency, then was vsed in King
Edwards dayes vnder B. Ridley, in that disputa-
tion at Cambridge) Doctor Cranmer was brought
in, and placed before them all to answer, and
defend his Sacramentary opinion, giuen vp
the day before in wrytinge, concerninge the
article of the *reall presence*. Fox according to his
custome noteth diuers graue circumstances,
as amonge others, that the beedle had provided
drinke, and offered the answerer, but he refused vwith
thanks. He telleth in like manner, that Doctor
Vveston the prolocutor offered him diuers
courtesyes for his body, yf he should need,
which I omitt for that they are homely:
against which Doctor Vveston notwithstanding
he afterwards stormeth, and maketh a great
inuectiue

Fox pag.
1300.

inued
that l
thari
wher
victo
the vi
non fi
cupp. S
the fa
hearin
liked
vrge
Thus
Doctor
sently
three
els-w
tions,
triall, g
not m
in ver
greate
all the
to the
19. L
again
tion of
thaw, A
by diu
that C
discipl
body,
Crosse

Inuectiue for his rudenes, and in particular for that he had (as Fox saith) his *Theseus* by him, that is to say a cuppe of wyne at his elbow, whervnto Fox ascribeth the gayninge of the victory, sayinge; *yt was no maruayle though he gott the victory in this disputation, he disputinge as he did,* Fox pag. 1326.
non sine suo *Theseo*, that is not without his tripling-cupp. So Fox. And yet further, that he holding the said cuppe at one tyme in his hand, and hearinge an argument made by another that liked him, said: *vrge hoc, nam hoc facit pro nobis*; vrge this, vrge this, for this maketh for vs. Thus pleased it Iohn Fox to be pleasant with *Doctor VVeston*; but when yow shall see, as presently yow shall, how he vrged Iohn Fox his three Martyrs, and *rammes of his flocke* (for so els-where he calleth them) in these disputations, not with the cuppe, but with substantiall, graue, and learned arguments, yow will not maruaile that he is so angry with him: for in very deed he brought them alwayes to the greatest exigents of any other, and more then all the rest together: Now then lett vs passe to the disputation.

19. *Doctor Chadsey* was the first that disputed against *Cranmer*, beginninge with the institution of Christs Sacrament, recorded by *S. Matthew*, *Marke*, and *Luke*, shewing out of them by diuers plaine clauses and circumstances, that Christ in his last supper, gaue vnto his disciples, not bread, but his true naturall body, which was given the next day on the Crosse, to all which *Cranmer* aunswered thus:

If

Fox pag.
1302. col. 1.
nam. 70.

D. Chadsey
first argu-
ment.

Sup. cap. 3.

#

The secōd
argumēt.

Fox pag.
1302.

If yow vnderstand by the body naturall, Organicum, that is hauing such proportion of members, as he had liuinge heere, then I aunswere negatiuely. By which aunswere we may perceauē, that this great Doctor, who had wrytten a great booke against the reall-presence, by which Latimer amongst others was made a Sacramentary, and stood therein vnto death vpon the credit of this booke (as after yow shall heare him often professe) vnderstandeth not the very state of the question betweene vs, for that we hold not Christs body in the Sacrament to be Organicall, in that manner as Cranmer heere imagineth, with externall dimensions & proportions of members as he liued vpon earth, though truly organicall, in another manner, without extension to place, as in our fourth and fift obseruations before sett downe we haue declared, so as he erringe in the very grounds and first principles of the controuersie, yow may imagine how he will proceed in the rest.

20. It was obiected vnto him next after this, that as a wise-man lyinge on his death-bedd, and hauing care that his heyres after his departure do liue in quiett, and not contēde about his Testament, doth not vse tropes and figures, but cleare and plaine speach in the said Testament; so must we presume of Christ, & for the confirmation of this, Doctor Vveston alleaged a place out of S. Augustine, De vnitatē Ecclesie vrginge this very same similitude; that yf the last words of any graue or honest man lyinge

Aug. l. de
vinitat. Eccl.
cap. 10.

yinge on his death-bedd, are to be beleueed, much more the last words of our Satiour Christ in his supper, to which argument I find no effectuall answer given at all, but only that *Crammer* saith: that he which speaketh by tropes and figures, doth not lie; but he answereth not to the other inconuenience, that his heyres may fall out about his Testament, the one vnderstandinge them literally, the other figuratiuely, as we & they do the words of Christ about his Sacrament.

21. Next to this is brought in a large testimony of *S. Chrysostome*, out of his homily vnto the people of *Antioch*, which beginneth: *Necessarium est, dilectissimi, mysteriorum discere miraculum, quid tandem sit, & quare sit datum, & qua rei militas, &c.* It is necessary, most dearely beloued; to know this myracle of mysteryes, what yt is, and why yt was giuen, and what profit cometh to vs therby, &c. And then *S. Chrysostome* declareth at large, how Christ most myraculously aboue all humaine power, giueth his body to be handled and eaten by vs in the Sacrament; so as we fasten our teeth in his flesh, and that he did more then euer any parents did, who many tymes giue their children to others to be fed, but Christ feedeth vs with his owne flesh, and with that very flesh by which he is our brother, and vnited vnto vs in flesh. Out of which discourse *D. Vveston* urged, that for so much as Christ is made our brother and kins-man, by his true, naturall & organicall flesh; ergo he gaue the same his true

3. Argument.

Chrysost.
hom. 61. ad
Pop. Antioch.

For pag.
1303 col. 2.
marg. 1.

naturall and organically flesh to vs to be eaten in the Sacrament. Wherto *Cranmer* answered: I graunt the consequence, and the consequent: Which is contrary to that he said a little before, (yf yow marke yt) that his organically body was not there.

22. But *Doctor Vveston* went further, that seeing he graunted this, then did yt follow also, that his true organically flesh was receaved in our mouth, which *S. Chrysostome* calleth our teeth. But this *Cranmer* denyed, and said, *he vvas eaten only by faith*: Whervpon *Vveston* came on him againe sayinge, that for so much as he gaue vs the selfe-same flesh to eate in the Sacrament (and this with our teeth, as *S. Chrysostome* saith) wherby he became our brother & kins-man, yt must needs import a reall eatinge: Wherto *Cranmer* answered: I graunt he tooke and gaue (in the Sacrament) the same true naturall and organically flesh, vvhetherin he suffered, but feedeth vs spiritually, and his flesh is receaved spiritually. This was his aunswere, and this he repeateth often, and from this he could not be drawne: And heere now yow see, the practise of that shift, wherof we haue spoken before in our eyght and nynth obseruation, whereby these willfull people, vnder the tearmes of spiritually and sacramentally, do delude them-selues, & their readers, as though they said somewhat to auoid Catholike arguments, taken out of ancient Fathers plaine and perspicuous authorizes, wheras indeed they say nothings in substance at all, but do turne and wynd and

hide

hide themselves vnder the sound of different words without sense. For yf yt be true as *Cranmer* heere graunted, that Christ gaue his true naturall and organicall flesh to be eaten in the Sacrament, and that with our teeth or corporall mouth, as *S. Chrysostome* saith, how can yt be denyed, bñt that we eat his flesh really, and not spiritually only, yf spiritually be opposite to really, as in *Cranmers* sense yt is, which vnderstandeth, *spiritually* and *figuratiuely* to be all one: but in our sense *spiritually* standeth with *really*, for that we hould Christs body to be receaued really and substantially in the Sacrament, but yet after a spirituall manner, different from that which the *Capharnaits* did imagine of a grosse carnall eatinge of Christs flesh, as other flesh is accustomed to be eaten, wherfore to imagine that Christs true naturall or organicall flesh is eaten truly in the Sacrament, and yet only absent, by faith, spiritually and in a figure, is to speake contradictories with one breath.

3. Diuers other texts and testimonyes of *S. Chrysostome* were alleaged by *Doctor Vveston* to confute this ideacall fiction of *Doctor Cranmer*, as that for example *homilia 83. in cap. 26. Math.* Where he saith amonge other thinges: *Veniat tibi in mentem, &c.* Lett yt come into thy remembrance with what honour thou art honoured, (in the Sacrament) what table thou dost inioy, for that we are nourished therein with the selfe-same thinge, which the Angells do behould and tremble at, &c. *VVho*

4. Argument of reply.

shall speake the powers of thy Lord? VVho shall declare forth all his praises? VVhat pastor hath euer nourished his shaepe vvith his owne flesh, &c. Christ feedeth vs vvith his owne body, and conioyneth & vniteth vs to him

therby. And againe vpon the 50. Psalme: *Pro cibo carne propria nos pascit, pro potu sanguinem suum nobis propinat.* In steed of meat, he feedeth vs with his owne flesh, and in steed of drinke he giueth vnto vs to drinke his owne blood. And

Chrysost.
hom. 38. in
Matth.

againe, homil. 83. in Matth. *Non fide tantum, sed reipsa nos corpus suum effecit, &c.* Not only by faith, but in deed he hath made vs his body.

Fox pag.
1303.

And finally for that yt was denyed expressely, Saint Chrysostome to meane that we receaued Christs body, with our corporall mouth, Doctor VVeston vrged these words of Saint Chrysostome: *Non vulgarem honorem consecutum est os nostrum excipiens corpus dominicum.* Our month hath gotten no small honour in that yt receaueth the body of our Lord.

Chrysost.
hom. 19. in
2. Cor. 13.

24. But all this will not serue, for still Cranmer answered by his former sleight thus: VVith our mouth, we receaue the body of Christ, and teare it vvith our teeth, that is to say the Sacrament of the body of Christ. Do yow see the euasion? And what may not be shifted of in this order, doth any minister in England vse to speake thus of his communion-bread, as S. Chrysostome in the place alleaged of the Sacrament, after the words of consecration? or do any of the ancient Fathers wryte so reuerently of the water of baptisme, which they would haue done, and ought to haue done, yf Christs body be not

Fox pag.
2533.col. 1.
Ann. 74.

other

otherwise present in this Sacrament, then the holy-Ghost is in that water, as *Crammer* oftentimes affirmeth, and namely some few lynes after the foresaid places alleaged? But *Doctor Vveston* seing him to decline all the forsaide authorities by this ordinary shift, of the words *spiritually* and *sacramentally*, vrged him by another way out of the same *Chrysostome*, concerning the honour due to Christs body vpon earth, *quod summo honore dignum est id tibi in terra ostendo, &c.* I do shew thee vpon earth, that which is worthy of highest honour, not Angells, nor Archangells, nor the highest heauens, but I shew vnto thee the Lord of all these things himselfe. Consider how thou dost not only behould heere on earth, that which is the greatest and highest of all things, but dost touch the same also, & not only touchest him, but dost eat the same, and hauinge receaued him, returnest home.

s. Argument.

Chrysost.
hom. 34.

25. Thus *S. Chrysostome*. Out of which place *Doctor Vveston* vrged him eagerly, excludinge all figures, and eatinge of Christs body absent by faith; for that *S. Chrysostome* saith not only *Ostendo tibi*, I do shew vnto thee, that which is worthy of highest honour aboue Angells, and Archangells, but *ostendo tibi in terra*, I shew yt to thee heere vpon earth, which signifieth the presence of a substance, wherto this highest honour is to be done, and that this thinge is seene, touched, & eaten, in the Church, which cannot be a figure, nor the sacramentall bread, for that highest honour is not due to hem,

D. Vveston
doth vrg
eagerly.
vrge hoc.
vrge hoc.

nor can yt be Christ abſent only in heauen, for
S. Chryſoſtome ſaith, I ſhew it thee heere on earth, &c.
 To all which preſſinges, when *Doctor Cranmer*
 had no other thing in effect to aunſwere, but
 theſe phraſes often repeated; that it is to be un-
 derſtood ſacramentally, and, I aunſwere that it is true
 ſacramentally, &c. The hearers fell to cry out,
 and hiſſe at him, clappinge their hands (ſaith Fox)
 and callinge him, *indoctum, imperitum, impudentem,*
vnlearned, vnſkillfull & impudent. And Fox
 to help out *Cranmer* in this matter, beſides all
 other excuſes, maketh this learned glosſe in
 the margent vpon *S. Chryſoſtomes* words: *Oſten-*
do tibi in terra, &c. I do ſhew vnto thee vpon
 earth, what is wortheiſt of higheſt honour, to
 witt, Chriſts body. The body of Chriſt (ſaith Fox)
 is ſhewed forth vnto vs heere on earth diuers wyayes, as
 in readinge ſcriptures, bearinge ſermons, and Sacra-
 ments, and yet neyther ſcriptures, nor ſermons, nor Sa-
 craments are to be worſhipped, &c. So he, which is
 as iuſt as Germans lippes. And I would aſke
 this poore glosſiſt, what maketh this note to
 the purpoſe of *S. Chryſoſtome*? for neyther doth
 he ſpeake of the different wayes, wherby
 Chriſts body may be ſhewed forth vpon
 earth, but ſaith that himſelfe did ſhew yt in
 the Sacrament vpon the Altar, to all that
 would ſee it. Nor doth he ſay that the meanes
 or wayes, wherby Chriſts body is ſhewed, are
 worthy greateſt honour or worſhipp. but that
 the thinge that is ſhewed forth, is worthy of
 higheſt honour. And how then ſtandeth Fox
 his glosſe with this ſenſe, or wherynto ſer-

Fox pag.
 1233.

1233.

ueth i
 obſtin
 throu
 ther
 26.
 the fi
 deale
 came
 corpore
 ſagines
 bloud
 be fact
 that ou
 and ou
 fruite
 vrged
 Chriſt
 Chriſt
 our mo
 byn de
 tullian
 is the Sa
 vnderſt
 Fox do
 fleſh be
 ment fe
 accordi
 I ſuſpe
 the bod
 for ſo
 when h
 ſoule is
 ſaith

ueth it, but only to shew these wretched-mens obstinacy, that one way or other will breake through, when they are hedged in by the Fathers authorities most plaine and manifest.

26. After this assault giuen by *Doctor VVeston*, the first opponent *Doctor Chadsey* returned to deale with *Cranmer* againe, & by issue of talke, came to vrge these words of *Tertullian*; *Caro corpore & sanguine Christi vescitur, ut anima de deo saginetur*. Our flesh is fedd with the body and bloud of Christ, to the end that our soule may be fattened with God; which is as much to say, that our mouth doth eate the body of Christ, and our mynd therby receaueth the spirituall fruite therof. Out of which words *D. VVeston* vtged, that seing our fletheateth the body of Christ (which cannot eat, but by the mouth) Christs body is really eaten and receaued by our mouth, which so often by *Cranmer* hath byn denyed, but now his words are: *Vnto Tertullian I aunswere, that he calleth that the flesh, which is the Sacrament*. Of which aunswere I cannot vnderstand what meaninge yt hath, except *Fox* do erre in settinge yt downe; for yf the flesh be the Sacrament, then must the Sacrament feed on the body and bloud of Christ, accordinge to *Tertullian* which is absurd. But I suspect that *Cranmers* meaninge was, that the body of Christ was called the Sacrament, for so he expoundeth himselfe afterward, when he saith: *The flesh liueth by the bread, but the soule is inwardly fedd by Christ*: so as when *Tertullian* saith; *our flesh is fedd by Christs body and bloud*,

6. Argument.
D. Chadsey.

Tertull. l. de resurrectione carnis. c. 2.

Cranmers shifting of Tertullians.

Tert. lib. 2.

Fox pag.
1304.7. Argu-
ment out
of S. Hi-
lary.

he would haue him to meane, that our flesh eateth the Sacramentall bread and wyne, that signifieth or figureth Christs body and bloud, & our soule feedeth on the true body of Christ by faith; but both *Doctor Chadsey* & *Doctor Vveston* refuted this shift presently by the words immediatly ensuinge in *Tertullian*: *Non possunt ergo separari in mercede, quas opera coniungit*: Our body and soule cannot be separated in the reward, whome the same worke doth conioyne together; and he meaneth evidently by the same worke or operation, the same eatinge of Christs body. Wherefore yf the one, that is the soule, doth eat Christs true body, as *Cranmer* confesseth, then the other, which is our flesh, eateth also the same body as *Tertullian* saith; and for that *Doctor Vveston* liked well this argument out of *Tertullian*, and said to *Doctor Chadsey*, *sticke to those words of Tertullian*, as Fox affirmeth, yt is like that the foresaid rule of *vrge*, *vrge*, feigned of him was meant at this tyme. But yf yt were, the reader may easily see that he had more to *vrge* against his adversary, than a port at his elbow; and so shall yow see by that which is to ensue; wherefore lett vs passe yet somewhat further in this combatt.

27. *Doctor Cranmer* hauinge breathed a little vpon the former sharp on-sett of *Chadsey* and *Vveston*, one *Doctor Tressam* began very grauely and moderately to *vrge* a new argument and discourse, which seemed very important, and after yt was *vrge*d, did more straine and presse the

the do-
ted. T
of S. H
the Ar
ty and
of his
presen
any
place
tation
his di
contr
sweet
Hillar
ster Cr
hould
Christ
substa
affect
Cath
cient
tween
ther a
shifte
nature
stance
when
for th
sence
of his
same
true by
not. r
the

the defendant, then any thing before disputed. The argument was founded vpon a place of *S. Hilary*, in his eight booke *de trinitate* against the *Arrians*, which both for the great authority and antiquity of the Father, and cleernes of his words and reason, seemed to all there present to conuince; nor could *Doctor Cramer* any way handsomely ridd himselfe of this place, but by his ordinary shiftinge interpretation, as presently shalbe seene. *Doctor Treſſam* his discourse was this, that whereas the like controuerſie for diuers points, had byn betweene the old Catholiks and *Arrians* in *Saint Hilaryes* tyme, as now is betweene vs and *Doctor Cramer*, and his fellowes, the Catholiks houldinge in that controuerſie, the vnion of Christ with his Father to be in nature and substance, and the *Arrians* in will only and affection: Whatſoeuer authorities the said Catholiks alleaged out of scriptures or auncient Fathers, for the naturall vnion betweene Christ and his Father; *I and my Father are one*. Such other places: the *Arrians* shifted of by sayinge: *that is true in vwill, but not in nature, yt is true in loue and affection, but not in substance*; euen as our Sacramentaries do now; when we alleage neuer so cleere authorities, for the true reall nature and substantiall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and therby of his reall vnion also with vs by eatinge the same; they delude all with sayinge only; *yt is true by grace and not by nature; yt is true by faith, but not in substance; yt is true figuratiuely and sacramentally,*

rally, but not really; yt is true in a signe, by a trope, after a certaine manner of speech; yt is true spiritually, and by a naturall property, but not indeed substantially: and such answers; but all these shifts (saith Doctor Tressam) did S. Hilary cutt of so longe agoe, for that he proueth the true naturall coniunction of Christ with his Father, by our true naturall coniunction with him, by eatinge his flesh in the Sacrament; so as except we deny the true essentiall, reall and substantiall vnity of Christ with his Father, we cannot accordinge to S. Hilary deny the true, reall and substantiall vnity of vs with Christ, by receauing his true naturall flesh in the Sacrament.

28. The place of S. Hilary is in his 8. booke of the blessed Trinity against the Arrians, as hath byn said, where he expoundeth these words of Christ in S. Iohns gospell: *As the liuing Father sent me, so do I also liue by the Father, and he that eateth my flesh, shall also liue throu me:* vpon which words of our Sauour S. Hilary saith: *This truly is the cause of our life, that vve haue Christ dwellinge by his flesh in vs, that are fleshye; which also by him shall liue in such sort, as he liueth by his Father.* Of which was inferred, that Christ dwelled in vs in flesh by the Sacrament, and not only in spirit. For better declaration wherof D. Tressam, before the allegation of these words, alleageth a larger discourse of the same S. Hilary, against the said Arrians vpon this point in these words: *I dem.und of them now (saith Hilary) who will needs haue the vnity of will only betwene the Father, and the Sonne, vwhether Christ be now in vs truly by nature, or only*

Epist. 6.

Fox pag.
3306.

Hilar. 1. 8.
de Trinit.

only by
nate in
the vvor
dwell
S. Hila
was n
spirite
to S. H
natura
loue o
flesh tr
not on
mation
words
reader
ding to
leth in
not only
porally
of Buce
but thi
was a l
leaneth
29. I
autori
with,
yt selfe
aduoc
dry lan
help h
we are
spirite
seekin

only by the agreement of vvilles? yf the vword be incarnate in very deed, and vve receaue at the Lords table the vword made flesh, how then is he to be thought not to dwell in vs naturally, &c. Out of which words of S. Hilary Doctor Tressam vrged, that Christs flesh was not only imparted vnco vs in faith and spiritt, but also really and naturally, according to S. Hilary, and that as his coniunction was naturall with his Father, and not in will and loue only: so is his coniunction with vs in flesh truly naturall, substantiall, and reall, and not only in spiritt and faith. For more confirmation wherof, Doctor Tressam alleaged also the words of Martyn Bucer, their late Protestant-reader in Cambridge, who wryteth that according to the holy Fathers meaning, *Christ dwelleth in vs* (by the body giuen in the Sacrament) not only by faith and loue, as absent, but naturally, corporally, and carnally, &c. To which authority of Bucer Doctor Cranmer gaue no other answer but this iest. *I know that Maister Bucer* (saith he) *was a learned man, but your faith is in good case which leaneeth vpon Bucer, &c.*

Bucer. l.
cont. A-
bramsen

29. But he could not so easily shake of the authority of Hilary, but was hardly pressed therewith, as yow may see readinge ouer the place ytselfe of this disputation, as also by that his aduocate Iohn Fox is constrayned to make sundry large notes, and glosses in the margent to help him out: For Doctor Tressam vrged, that we are not only vnited to Christ by faith and spiritt, but carnally also: Whervnto Cranmer seekinge an euasion answereth: *I say that Christ*

Fox pag
1306.

was communicated vnto vs not only by faith, but in very deed also, vvhhen he vvas borne of the Virgin. Behould the shift, we talke of Christ imparted to vs in the Sacrament, and so doth Hilary; he answereth, that Christ was imparted to vs in the incarnation; and yet yf yow consider, our flesh was then rather imparted to him, then his to vs. And againe, Turks and Infidells haue as much coniunction with him by the incarnation as we, for that they are men, & the flesh that he tooke, was common to all; So as heere yow see nothing but euasions sought for; and Doctor Tressam perceauing that he could gett no more of him to the purpose, fell to pray for him; but Doctor VVeston followed the argument much further, as there yow may see, for yt is ouerlonge to be alleaged heere. The principall point is, that S. Hilary auoweth: That our coniunction with Christ is not only by will, affection, and faith; but naturall also and reall, by eatinge his flesh in the Sacrament, as himselfe is naturally vnited to his Father and not only by will. And when Doctor Cranmer sought many holes to runne out at, VVeston presteth him againe with other words of S. Hilary explicatinge himselfe, which are these.

Hilary. *ibid.* 30. These things (saith he) are recited of vs to this end, because heretiks feigninge a vniety of vwill only, betwene the Father, and the sonne, did vse the example of our vniety vvith God, as though we being vnited to the sonne, and by the sonne to the Father only by obedience, and vwill of Religion, had no propriety of the naturall coniunction by the Sacrament of the body and blood.

Lo heere yt is accompted a point of Arrianisme by *S. Hilary*, to hould that we are vnited to Christ only by obedience and will of Religion, and not by propriety of naturall communion with him, by eatinge his flesh in the Sacrament of his body and bloud. Whervpon *Doctor Vveston* vrged often and earnestly, that not only by faith, but by the nature of his flesh in the Sacrament, we are conioyned not spiritually only, and by grace, but naturally and corporally; Whervnto *Cranmers* aunswere was in these words: *I graunt that Cyrill and Hilary do say that Christ is vnited to vs, not only by vwill, but also by nature, he is made one with vs carnally and corporally, because he tooke our nature of the Virgin Mary, &c.* Do yow see his runninge from the Sacrament to the natiuity; but heare out the end.

Vvest. Hilary, where he saith Christ commu-
nicated to vs his nature, meaneth not by his
natiuity, but by the Sacrament. *Cran.* Nay he
communicated to vs his flesh by his natiuity.

Vvest. We communicated to him our flesh, *Fox ibid.*
when he was borne. *Cran.* Nay he commu-
nicated to vs his flesh when he was borne, &c.,
that I will shew yow out of *Cyrill*. *Vvest.* ergo,
Christ being borne gaue vs his flesh. *Cran.* In
his natiuity he made vs partakers of his flesh.

Vvest. Wryte syrs. *Cranm.* Yea wryte. And
so ended this Encounter, brought (as yow
see) to two absurdities on *Cranmers* side; the
one, that where *S. Hilary* speaketh of the Sa-
crament of the body and bloud of Christ; he
flyeth still to the incarnation: the other, that
he

he saith; Christ to haue imparted his flesh to vs in the incarnation, wherein he tooke ours. Wherefore Doctor Chadsey seing the matter in this state, interrupted them by accusing Cranmer to haue corrupted this place of S. Hilary, in his booke against the reall presence translating these words: *Nos verè sub mysterio carnis corporis sui sumimus*, we receaue vnder the true mystery the flesh of his body; whereas he should haue said: *VVe do receaue truly vnder a mystery* (or Sacrament) *the flesh of his body*; vvhich fraud Cranmer could by no other wayes auoid, but by sayinge; that his booke had *Verò* and not *verè*, which Iohn Fox saith was a small fault, and yet yow see yt altereth all the sense, as yt a man should say *Pistor* for *Pastor*.

31. The next conflict to this was betweene Doctor Tenge, and Doctor Cranmer, wherein Tenge accusinge him first for denyinge of principles, and consequently, that they could hardly go forward with any fruitfull disputation, except they agreed vpon certayne grounds, he made sundry demaunds vnto him, as first, whether there were any other naturally true body of Christ, but his organicall or instrumentall body? *Item* whether sense and reason, ought not to giue place in this mystery to faith? *Further*, whether Christ be true in his words, & whether he mynded to do that, which he spake at his last supper? And finally, whether his words were effectuell, and wrought any thinge or no? To all which Doctor Cranmer answered affirmatiuely, graunting that the said words of Christ

D. Tenge
disputeth.

Christ did worke the institution of the Sacrament, whervnto Doctor Tonge replied, that a figuratiue speech wrought nothinge, ergo yt was not a figuratiue speech when he said: *Hoc est corpus meum*. And albeit D. Cranmer soughe by two or three struglinges to slipp from this inference, sayinge that yt was sophistry, yet both Doctor Tonge and Doctor Vveston, who came in still at his turne, said; *sticks to this argument*. It is a figuratiue speech, ergo yt vvorketh nothinge, that quickly they brought Doctor Cranmer in plaine words to graunt, that a figuratiue speech vvorketh nothinge: Wherof they inferred the contrary againe on the other side: A figuratiue speech (say they) vvorketh nothing by your confession, but the speech of Christ in the supper, as yow now graunted, vvrought somewhat, to wirt the institution of the Sacrament, ergo the speech of Christ in the supper vvvas not figuratiue, which is the overthrow of the foundation of all sacramentall buildinge.

Fox pag:
1307. col. 2.
num. 30.

And heere yow must note by the way, that Fox doth not crowne the head of this syllogisme with any *Baroco*, or *Bocardo* in the margin, as he is commonly wont to do with the rest, for that yt pleased him not. Wherfore to leaue him, we shall passe to Doctor Cranmer himselfe, whose aunswere yow shall heare in his owne words: I aunswere (saith he) that these are meere sophismes, for speech doth not vvorke, but Christ by speech doth worke the Sacrament, I looke for scriptures at your hands for they are the foundation of disputations. So he. And yow may see by this

Fox angry
vvith a
syllo-
gisme.

his

his speech, that he was entangled, and would gladly be ridde of that he had graunted, for that both the *maior* and *minor* propositions were of his owne grauntinge, and the silligisme good both in moode and forme, though the conclusion troubled both him and Fox, and the refuge whervnto both of them do runne in this necessity, the one in the text, the other in the margent, is very fond, sayinge that *not the speech of Christ, but Christ did worke*, as though any man would say, that a speech worketh, but by the vertue of the speaker; and consequently yf Christ do worke by a figuratiue speech, then doth a figuratiue speech worke by his power and vertue, and so was yt fondly graunted by *Cramer* before, that the figuratiue speech of Christ, in institutinge the Sacrament (for of that was the question) did not worke; and yt is a simple euasion now, to runne from Christs speech to Christ himselfe as though there could be a diuersity; every man may see these are but euasions.

#

33. But now further *Doctor Yonge* refuted largely this assertion, that *Christs speech worketh not* out of diuers and sundry plaine testimonies of the Fathers, which there openly he caused to be read and namely *S. Ambrose*, as well in his booke *de iniciandis*, as *de Sacramentis*, where he handlerh this matter of purpose, to proue that the speech of Christ in the Sacrament, to witte *hoc est corpus meum*, did worke & conuert bread and wyne into flesh and bloud, and proueth the same by many other exáples of scripture.

Am. de
qui d'inter-
prete.

Ambr. L. 4.
de Sacram.
cap. 46

254-2
Lafayette
No 1 7d

S. Ambrose
most
cleere
against
Cramer
and F.

24

21

士

not.

not, but yow see the fond euasion of *Crammer*
 and *Fox* his aduocate, clearly refuted by *S. Ambrose*;
 where they say, that the speech or words of
 Christ worke not, but Christ by the words; as though
 there were a great diuerſity in that point. But
 now lett vs see, how they will scramble ouer
 this authority of *S. Ambrose*, that saith expresse-
 ly, both that the speech of Christ did worke
 potently, and worke the conuersion of bread
 and wyne into flesh and bloud: first *Fox* hath
 this note in the margent against *S. Ambrose*, as
 though he had miscompared the words of
 creation, with the words of the institution of
 the Sacrament. The Lord Iesus (saith *Fox*) vsed
 not heere comminution in the Sacrament, as in
 creation, for we read not *Fiat hoc corpus meum*, as yve
 read *Fiat lux*, &c. Do yow see the mans subtile
 obseruation, or rather simple & sottish cam-
 lation against so graue a Father? The words:
Hoc est corpus meum, this is my body, imployeth
 somewhat more then *Fiat corpus meum*: lett yt
 be my body; for that yt signifieth the thinge
 done already, which the other willeth to be
 done. And so for this we will leaue *Iohn Fox* to
 strue with *S. Ambrose*, about the vsinge or abu-
 singe of scriptures alleaged by him. And so
 much of *Fox*.

S. Ambrose
 corrected
 by *Fox*.

Revised
from
words
of
ambrose
corrected
by
fox

35. But how doth *Crammer* himselfe auoyd
 this plaine authority of *S. Ambrose*, thinke yow?
 Yow shall heare yt in his owne words, for
 they are very few to so large an authority. All
 these thinges (saith he) are common, I say that God
 doth chiefly worke in the Sacraments. Do yow see
 his

his breuitie and obscuritie? but his meaning is,
that whereas before he had denyed, for a shift,
that Christs words did worke, but only
Christ by his words (a difference without a
diuersity) now seeing *S. Ambrose* so plaine to the
contrary, in settinge forth the workinge of
Christs words, he seeketh another shift in this
answere, which is, that albeit Christs words do
worke in the Sacraments, yet Christ chiefly, as though
any controuersy were in this, or any man had
denyed yt. But what saith he to the mayne
point, wherein *S. Ambrose* affirmeth not only
Christs vvords to be *Operatoria*, vvorkinge-
words, but that their worke is to make bread,
the true and naturall body of Christ after they
be vttered by the Priest? nothing truly in sub-
stance doth he aunswere herevnto, but after
his shifts he saith only, that ye vvare called the body
of Christ, as the holy-ghost vvare called the dove, and
S. Iohn Baptiste vvare called *Elias* (which are but bare
signes & representations, as euery one seeth)
may he goeth againe presently from this,
which heere he had graunted, that God worketh
in the Sacraments: For when Doctor Tonge vrged
him thus: If God worke in the Sacraments, he wor-
keth in this Sacrament (of the Eucharist) *Cramer*
aunswereth: God worketh in his faithfull, not in the
Sacraments. And thus he goeth forward graun-
tinge and denyinge, turninge and wyndinge,
and yet poore miserable man he would not
come to the truth, nor had grace to ac-
knowledge the same laid before him, but toy-
led himselfe in contradictions, endeauouring

How
Cramer
shifteth of
Saints Am-
brose.

Fox pag.
1308 col. 1.
num. 70.

*Ambro. l. 4.
de Sacram.
cap. 5.*

to shift of most euident authorities of ancient Fathers, by impertinent interpretations. As when Doctor Tenge vrged him with those cleere words of S. Ambrose: *Before the words of Christ be spoken, the chalice is full of wyne and water, but when the words of Christ haue wrought their effect, then it there made the blood that redeemed the people.* Cranmer answered: that the words of Christ wrought no otherwise in this Sacramēt, then in baptisme. Ambrose said (quoth he) that the blood is made, that is, the Sacrament of the blood is made, *fit sanguis the blood is made, that is to say ostenditur sanguis; the blood is shewed forth there.*

*Ambro. l. 6.
de Sacram.
cap. 1.*

36. These and such like yvere Cranmers sleights to ridd himselfe that day, and yet did not Doctor Chadsey and VVaston leaue him for these starts, but followed him close with other cleere places of S. Ambrose, the one expounding the other. As for example, *Fortè dices, &c.* Perhaps you may say, how are these things true? I vvhich see the similitude, do not see the truth of the blood: First of all I tould thee of the word of Christ, vvhich so vttereth, that yt can change and turne the kinds ordayned of nature, &c. And againe in another place. *Ergo didicisti, &c.* Therefore thou hast learned that of bread is made the body of Christ, and that wyne and wyater is putt into the cupp, but by consecration of the heauenly word it is made blood. *Sed fortè dices speciem sanguinis non videri, sed habet similitudinem:* But perhaps you will say, that the shape or forme of blood is not scene; but yet it hath the similitude. So S. Ambrose, and for that he saith, as

you

yow see, that albeit the bloud after consecration, hath not the shew or forme of true bloud; yet hath ye similitude, (for that the forme of wyne commeth neereſt to the like-
neſſe of bloud) heerof *Crammer* laying hands, could not be drawne from affirminge that *S. Ambroſe* meaninge is, that it is not true naturall bloud after the consecration, but beareth a similitude only, representation, or tipe thereof, which is quite contrary to *S. Ambroſe* his whole drift and discourse, yf yow consider ye out of passion,

37. After these bickerings about *S. Ambroſe*, were vrged against him, by the two Doctors, *Chadsey* and *Vveſſon*, diuers other Fathers, as *Iuſtinus Martyr* about 14. hundred yeares gone, whose in his Apology for Christians writeth: that as by the word of God, *Ieſus Chriſt our Saviour* being made flesh, had both flesh, and bloud for our ſalvation: so are we taught, that the meate consecrated by the word of prayer inſtituted by him (vvhich our bloud and flesh are nourished by communion) is the flesh and bloud of the ſame *Ieſus*, that was made flesh. Out of which place they vrged, that as Chriſt is truly and really incarnate, so is he truly and really in the Sacrament, accordinge to *S. Iuſtinus*, and that our flesh and bloud is nourished by that communion, and consequently in *Saint Iuſtinus* tyme, ye was not held that Chriſts body was receaued only by faith.

38. The words of *Saint Irenaeus* were vrged in like manner, he being another Martyr of the ſame age with *S. Iuſtinus*, who wryteth thus:

The testimony of
S. Iuſtinus
examined.

Iuſtin.
Apol. 2.

Iren. lib. 4.
cap. 2. cons.
therof.

Eum calicem, qui est ex creatura. suum corpus confir-
mauit, ex quo nostra auger corpora, &c. This is the
cupp, which being a creature, he confirmed to
be his body, by which he encreaseth our bo-
dies, when both the cupp mixed & the bread
broken, hath ioyned to y^e the word of God,
yt is made the Eucharist of the body & blond
of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh
is encreased and consisteth. By which words
the said Doctors proued, that the flesh and
bloud of Christ was otherwise held by *S. Ire-*
new to be in the Sacrament, and redeaued by
ys, than only by faith, seing our bodies also
are nourished therwith; yea the very substance
of our flesh is encreased and consisteth therby,
as his words are. To all which *Cranmer* had
no other aunswere, but his old shift, that the
Sacrament of the body and bloud, was called the flesh
and bloud of Christ, though really yt be not. And from
this he could not be drawne: And so finally
the ryme drawinge late, they vtged him there
publicly with certayne falsities, vsed in his
booke against the reall presence, and besides
those that had byn objected before, as for ex-
ample, *Doctor Chadsey* objected a manifest cor-
ruption in translatinge the foresaid place of
S. Iustine, which *Cranmer* excused no other-
wise, but that he translated not *Iustine* word
for word, but only gave the meaninge; but
the other, as also *Doctor Harpsfield*, shewed that
he peruerred the whole meaninge; and so yt is
euidēt to him that readeth *Iustine*.

39. *Doctor Vveston* objected a place corrupted

Diners
corruptions
objected
to *Cran-*
mer.

For pag.
3109.

in

in *Emissum* by putting in the word *spiritualibus*,
Cranmer answered, that yt was so in the de-
 crees. *Doctor VVeston* replied, that he had left
 out diuers lynes of purpose, vvhich made
 against him in *Emissum* for the *shall* presence.
Cranmer answereth: *this booke hath not that.*
VVeston objected another place falsified, where
 for *Honora corpus Dei tui*, honour the body of thy
 God, to witt of Christ, *Cranmer* had translated
 yt thus: *honour him vvhich is thy God.* Wherto he
 answered, that he did it not without a weigh-
 ty cause, that men should not thinke that
 God had a body. *Doctor VVeston* objected also,
 that alleaging a sentence out of *Scotus*, he had
 left out a clause, that made much to the pur-
 pose in the matter handled, to witt *secundum*
apparentiam, as may appeare. *Cranmer* answered
 iestingly: *that is a great offence I promise you.* Ano-
 ther place in like manner was objected, as
 peruerred by him in *Scotus* words, as also one
 or two in *S. Thomas Aquinas*, wherto I find no
 answer; but disputation is broken vp with
 this cry of the auditory, in fauour of the Ca-
 tholike party, *vicis veritas*, the truth hath had
 the victory; and with this we shall also end
 this first disputation against *Cranmer*, hauinge
 byn forced to be longer then we purposed at
 the beginnunge, & therefore we shalbe so much
 the shorter, yf it may be, in that which ensueth
 with *Ridley* and *Lutyer*.

*Out of the Disputation with D. Ridley
in the same divinity-school at Ox-
ford, the next day after Cranmer,
to wit, the 17. of Aprill 1554. §. 3.*

*D. Smith
opponent.*

40. The next day followinge (saith Fox)
was brought forth Doctor Ridley to defend in
the same questions of the *real presence*, *Tran-
substantiation*, and *Sacrifice*, against whomes Do-
ctor Smith was the first and principall oppo-
nent, for which cause Fox, before he begin-
neth to relate the combat, maketh a particu-
lar inuective against him, for that he had byn
vnconstant in Religion, the simple fellow not
consideringe that y^e had byn true; yet that
the same might be objected with much more
reason, against these his chiefe champions,
Cranmer, *Ridley* and *Latimer*, that had byn Ca-
tholike Priests for many yeares togeather; But
Fox his great anger against Doctor Smith was,
for that he pressed hardly B. Ridley in his dispu-
tation, and so did Doctor Weston also, as after
yow shall see, for that vpon all occasions he
came in with *Vrge hoc, vrge hac*; but for the rest
Ridley vvas most courteously vsed by them
both, and offered to haue his opinions taken
in wrytinge, and that he should haue space till
saturday after to consider of them, and that
vwhat bookes soeuer he vwould demaund,
should

should be deliuered to him, and that he might choose any two of the whole company to be his seuerall notaryes, and he tooke Maister Iohn Jewell afterward made B. of Salisbury by Q. Elizabeth, and Maister Gilbert Monson, that had byn notaryes vnto B. Crammer the day before.

41. But the greatest difference, and difficulty fell out, for that Ridley having brought thither with him his opinion, and large explication thereof already wrytten, would needs read the same openly to the whole auditory, which was penned in such bitter, spitefull & blasphemous termes, with such abominable scotches, and raylinge contemptuous speech, against the sacred mysteres, and the vse thereof, as the commissioners were often tymes forced to interrupt him, and commaund him to sylence, or to begin disputation; neyther wherof would he do, but with an obstinate face go foreward in readinge his declarations, wherupon, Doctor VVeston callinge vnto him said, as Fox relateth: *Tow viter blasphemyes with an impudent face.* Wherfore finally they made him breake of, promisinge that they would read & ponder all themselves, not being convenient to infect mens eares with publike readinge therof, but that he might defend the same, as occasion should be offered in his answers and disputations.

42. The first argument brought against him by Doctor Smith was, for ouerthrowinge that principall foundation of the Sacramentary heresie: *Christe body is in heauen, ergo it is not in the*

Two notaryes chosen

Fox pag. 1312

1312

1312

Fox pag. 1312

SACRA

The first
argument
about
Christ
being in
many
places.

See of Me-
lancthon
supra mens
Decemb.

Ad. 9.
c. 16.

Sacrament. Wherof yow haue heard often be-
fore, for that both Peter Martyr alleaged yt as a
cheefe fortresse of their faith, though Philipp
Melancthon, that is a Calendar-saint together
with Peter Martyr, as before yow haue heard,
did say, that he had rather offer himselfe vp to death,
then to affirme vwith the Sacramentaryes, that Christi
body cannot be but in one place at once. And this was
a principall ground also of John Lambert, bur-
ned for Sacramentary opinions vnder K. Hen-
ry the eyght, against whome Doctor Crammer,
then Archbuihopp of Canterbury, was the first
and cheefest disputer after the King, and spe-
cially tooke vpon him to confute this reason
of Lambert as vayne and false, and contrary to
scripture, as before yow haue heard in the sto-
ry of Lambert. And the same reasons, and ar-
guments, which Crammer vsed against Lambert
out of the scriptures, doth Doctor Smith vse now
against Ridley, to witte that Christ appeared corpo-
rally and really on earth, after his assension, to S. Paul
and others, ergo, his being in heauen is no les to his reall
presence in the Sacrament. The antecedent he
proued out of the Acts of the Apostles, and
S. Pauls Epistles, where yt is shewed, that
Christ appeared vnto him after his assension;
but Ridley did not aunswere this argument, as
Lambert, and other Sacramentaryes before
him had done, denyinge that Christ appeared
corporally and really vpon earth, but rather
that his voyce was heard from heauen, but he
said, that Christ left heauen for a tyme, and
came downe. I do not (saith he) so straitly tie
Christ

Christ vnto heauen, that he may not come into earth at
his pleasure, howbeit I do affirme, that yt is not possible
for him to be in earth and heauen at one tyme. So hee,
wherunto Doctor Smith replyed: ergo yt is lawfull
for Christ to be here present on earth when he will.
Ridley. Yea when he will yt is lawfull. Smith. „
I urge his ascendinge to heauen, doth not re- „
strayne his reall presence in the Sacrament. „
Ridley. I do not gainsay, but that yt is lawfull „
for him to appeare on earth, when he will, „
but proue yow that he will.

43. Lo heere another starting hole: but yet
first yow see the great Sacramentary bull-
warke, so much stood vpon by others, that
Christ is in heauen at the right hand of God, and that
the heauens must receaue him, vntill the day of iudge-
ment, and consequently cannot be vpon earth or in the
Sacrament, is quite forsaken by Ridley, graun-
tinge that this argument proueth nothinge:
he is ascended to heauen, ergo, he is not on earth; for
he may leaue heauen and come downe, accor-
dinge to Ridley. Yea Ridleys owne principall
ground is forsaken by him, for that among his
sue principall grounds and head springs (for so he cal-
leth them) sett downe by him in his Cambridge
disputation, & wherby he did inclyne to this sentence
and iudgement, (for then he was but inclininge)
the last was (yf yow remember) the most sure
beleefe of the article of our faith, he ascended into hea-
uen, which now yow see may stand without
this doctrine. Secondly, wheras he denyeth
that Christ will depart from heauen at any
tyme, sayinge: proue yow yf he vrill, yet very
soone

For pag.
1314. col. 2.
num. 18.

Math. 14.
Act. 3.
Coloss. 3.

* For pag.
1361.

laene after being pressed by Doctor Smith out of the scriptures, that Christ after his ascension vnder some rightly, really, and corporally vpon earth, he answered in these words: I graunt the antecedent; (that is Christ did appeare on earth). Smith. Do you graunt the antecedent? Ridley. Yea I graunt the antecedent, because I know that there be certayne ancient Fathers of that opinion. Heere you see that Ridley, by grauntinge this antecedent, to witte, that Christ after his ascension, did appeare really and corporally vpon earth, eyther doth contradict himselfe, when he denyed before, that Christ would euer come out of heauen (notwithstandinge he could) or els he must graunt, that Christ appeared vpon earth against his will, or without his owne will, which were a greater absurdity, then any of the other.

44. And furthermore he contradicteth himselfe againe, in that he said a little before, that Christ may leaue heauen, and come downe into earth when he will: For being asked by Doctor Smith this question: Doth Christ so sit at the right hand of his Father, that he doth neuer forsake the same? Ridley answered in these words: If you vnderstand his sitting to be after a corporall manner of sitting, so as he is alwayes permanent in heauen? Which if yt be true, then is that false which before he said, that Christ body is not so tyed to heauen, but that he may come downe into the earth when he will. And much more false is yt, that Christ did really and corporally appeare vpon earth to Saint Paul, and others a little before he graunted: so as by these you may see the briars wherinto

Wharleso Ridley was driven about this argument.

45. The third point to be noted in these inconstant speeches of Ridley, is, that yt is not possible for Christs body to be in heauen and earth at one tyme; and yet when we vrge them with impiety for laying impossibilityes to Gods omnipotency, they will presently runne to that answere, as Ridley also afterward doeth, that they dispute not what God can do, but what he will do. Wherefore to returne to our disputation; when Doctor VVeston heard him talke of this impossibility, & that Christ yf he would appeare in earth, must leaue heauen, he tooke vpon him to conuince this falsity, out of two authoritiees, the one of S. Chrysostome, the other of S. Bernard. S. Chrysostome his place, is vpon the Epistle to the Hebrews, talkinge of the dayly externall sacrifice of Christians, offered throughout the world in many churches at once, saith thus, *una est hac oblatio, non multa, &c.* this oblation we offer is one and not many, and how is it one and not many, which being once offered vp in *santo sanctorum* (to witt, vpon the Crosse) notwithstandinge is offered by vs dayly? This sacrifice (which dayly we offer) is a paternes of that (once offered on the Crosse) and alwayes we offer the selfe same, not offeringe now one lambe, and to morrow another, but alwayes the selfe same; wherefore heere is but one sacrifice, for that other wayes by this meanes, yf there be many sacrifices in many places, there should be many Christs,

Chrysost.
Ioh. 17. iii
ep. ad Hebr.

Christe, which is not so, but one Christ in all places; *qui & hic plenus, & illic plenus, unum corpus*; which Christ is fully heere; and fully there, being but one body, &c. 46. Out of which place Doctor VVeston did vrge B. Ridley very straitly, who first, would seeme to make light of the place, sayinge: *these things make nothinge against me*: but VVeston vrged: how say you then, *one Christ is in all places, heere fully, and there fully*. Ridley. *One Christ is in all places, but not one body is in all places, &c.* And this euasion pleaseth so much John Fox, as he wryteth in the margent, *one Christ, but not one body in all places*, as though Christ could be separated from his body, or as though S. Chrysostome did not expressely talke of one body: *Heere Christ fully, and there Christ fully one body*; and the very next words of Chrysostome immediatly followinge are these; *even as then Christ offered in many places, is one body, and not many bodies, so is the sacrifice also but one*. But lett vs heare Doctor VVeston vrge the same: Weston. *One body saith Chrysostome*. Ridley. *But not after the manner of bodily substance he is in all places; not by circumscription of places: for hic & illic, heere and there in Chrysostome do asigne no place as Augustine saith: *Sursum est Dominus, & vbique est veritas Domini**. The Lord is aboue, but the truth of the Lord is in all places. Weston. *You cannot so escape, Saint Chrysostome saith, not the verity of Christ is one, but one Christ is in all places both heere and there*. Ridley. *One sacrifice is in all places, because of the unity of him; vvhome the sacrifice doth signifie*.

not that the sacrifices be all one and the same.

47. Marke now heere gentle reader, what yt is to dispute with these people, that seeke after nothings bur shifts & holes to runne out at, or slipp away? Consider how many they be vpon this only place. For first when Ridley was pressed with *S. Chrysostomes* authority, as yow haue heard, prouinge euidently, that Christ could be at one tyme in diuers places, his first shift was, that yt maketh nothings against him; and then, that albeit Christ be in many places, yet his body cannot be in many places, as though Christ were in any place without his body: And then againe yt being shewed, that *S. Chrysostome* speaketh expressely of Christs body, the next shift was, that his body is not there after the ordinary manner of bodily presence, to witt, by circumscription of place, which is quite from the purpose, for that we hould this also, as before you haue heard in the fifth & sixt obseruations, to witt, that Christ is not circumscriptiuely in the Sacrament. And further yt is another absurd shift, or rather ignorance in Ridley (and may be the fift or sixt about this matter) to as firme as heere he doth, that Christs body is nor by circumscription euery-where, or in all places: for we hould also, not only, that which he saith, by circumscription, but that no wayes, either circumscriptiuely, or definitiuely, or sacramentally is Christs body euery-where, but only in many distinct places, by Gods omnipotent will. The other of vbiquity being a pro-

An obseruation of
Ridleyes
shifts vpon
one place
only of
S. Chrysostome.

property of God ordinary only, to be in every place at one time, as before we have shewed. And lastly to follow Ridley and his riddles no further about this matter, the words of *S. Augustine* are foolishly alleaged by him; that the Lord is above, but the truth of the Lord is in all places: for as Doctor *Veston* well noteth and telleth him, we talke not here, how the Lords truth is every where, but whether Christs body be in diuers places or noe: for Christs truth is euerywhere, where his faith grace or power is, but not his body. And albeit his truth admit not the circumstances or proprieties of places *sursum* and *deorsum*, yet his body doth: which Ridley considered not, when he brought this example, but only desyred to say some-what, though neuer so much from the purpose.

48. And the like shiftes he sheweth in his last answere about this place of *S. Chrysostome*, when Doctor *Veston* vrginge, that one Christ and one body is in all places whersoeuer his sacrifices are offered, he answereth not to the words of *Saint Chrysostome* at all, but saith only at randome, that one sacrifice is in all places (*S. Chrysostome* saith one body) because of the unity of him whome the sacrifice doth signifie, which is as much to say in his sense, as the sacrifice being but a signe or signification of Christ that is one, is multiplyed in diuers places. And what great miracle is this I pray yow, to multiply many figures in diuers places of one thinge, who may not do so: and yet *Saint Chrysostome* setteth yt downe for a wonderfull strange and admirable matter,

that

that
heer
rym
Rid
and
fost
49.
is in
Ho
tha
of t
defe
befo
full
in t
of t
art p
and
gau
of Be
con
to t
lecu
Sain
need
cyte
of t
sing
conc
tyme
So h
some
sthi

that one Christ the selfe-same Lambe, one body, fully
heere and fully there, should be offered at one
tyme in many places, which miracle in Doctor
Ridleyes sense is both easy and no miracle at all,
and so much about this place of Saint Chry-
sostome.

49. The second authority out of S. Bernard
is in these words: *Vnde hoc nobis piissime Iesu, &c.*
How cometh this vnto vs, O most pious Iesu,
that we seeely wormes creeping on the face
of the earth, that are but dust and ashes, should
deserue to haue thee present in our hands, &
before our eyes, who sitteth both whole and
full at the right hand of the Father, and who
in the moment of one houre, from the risinge
of the sunne, vnto the goinge downe thereof,
art present one and the selfe-same in many
and diuers places, &c. To this place D. Ridley
gaue diuers answers: First (saith he) these words
of Bernard make nothing for you at all. This is very
confidently spoken as you see, no lesse then
to the place of S. Chrysostome before; and I be-
leeue he will not stand longe vnto yt: For yf
Saint Bernard doth meane as he saith, he must
needs make much for vs in the words now re-
cyted, wherein I referre me to the iudgement
of the reader. Wherefore Maister Ridley not tru-
stinge much to this answeere, passeth to his se-
cond sayinge; I know that Bernard was in such a
tyme, that in this matter he may worthily be suspected.
So he. And yet least he might seeme to leese
some credit in reiectinge S. Bernard, he hath
a third answeere thus: notwithstanding (saith he)

Bern. serm.
de Cana
Dom.

For p.
1113.

I will so expound him rather then reiect him, that he shall make nothinge for you at all. Lo heere his last cast; and this he learned of his Maister Caluyn, not so much to reiect in words the Fathers, as Luther did, but rather by false and crafty interpretation, sleightly to auoyd them, which indeed is not humility but double impiety; and more impious to the Fathers themselues, then to be vtterly denied, for by this meanes they are made coadiutors of heretiks: lett vs heare then S. Bernard expounded by Ridley to his purpose: S. Bernard (quoth he) saith, that we haue Christ in a mystery, in a Sacrament, vnder a veyle or couer; in the meane tyme heere now he saith, that the verity of Christ is euery-vvhere. So he. And is not Ridley ridiculous heere? let the reader compare S. Bernards words before alleaged, with this exposition of Ridley, and he will say that the commentary hitteth as right the text, as the blynd-fold-man doth hitt the hennes head on the ground, when his face is another way from her. And thus much of Doctor Riddleys three aunswers to this place of Saint Bernard.

Another
place of
S. Chryso-
stome vr-
ged about
Elias.

Chrysoft.
hom. 2. ad
Pop. An-
thw.

50. After this Doctor Smith vrged him againe with another place of S. Chrysofome, where he makinge a comparison, betweene Elias the Prophet and Christ, saith, that Elias left his cloake to Elizeus with his double spiritt, when he went vp to heauen; but Christ did much more miraculously, for that he left vs his flesh in the Sacrament, and yet tooke the same vp with him: *Helias quidem melotem discipulo reliquit;*
filius

filium autem Dei ascendens, suam nobis carnem dimisit; Elias quidem exutus, Christus autem & nobis reliquit, & ipsam habens ascendit. Elias indeed at his departure, left his cloke or hearcloth vnto his disciple *Elizeus*; but the sonne of God ascending vp to heauen left his owne flesh vnto vs: *Elias* left his cloake, but Christ both left vnto his his flesh & yet carryed the same with him. Which plaine place when *Ridley* went about to delude, as he had done other former places, by sayinge that *Chrysostomes* meaninge was; that he left his flesh vpon earth not really and substantially, but to be receaued after a spirituall communication, by grace, addinge this example: *as we also* (quoth he) *by hearing the gospell, and by faith:* So as by this aun(were we haue Christs flesh no otherwise present by meanes of the Sacrament, then we haue him present by hearinge the gospell, or by beleeuinge in him, which is to euacuate wholly the speech & comparison of *S. Chrysostome*. Wherefore to ouerthrow this shift, *Doctor Smith* alleaged another plaine place of the same *Chrysostome* in confirmation of this where he saith: *O miraculum! o Dei benignitatem! qui sit sum sedet, tempore sacrificij hominum manibus continetur, &c.* O miracle! o goodnesse of God! that he which sitteth aboue, is conteyned in mens hands in the tyme of the sacrifice. But all this would not serue, for he auoyded this as he had done the other, sayinge: *he that sitteth there (to witt in heauen) is heere present in mystery and by grace, and is holden of the godly, &c.* And finally

*Chrysost.
l. 3. de Sa-
cerdotio.*

though there were diuers boues in this matter, yet could nothinge be gotten more.

51. But to this sense, Doctor Smith, Doctor Seton, Doctor Harpesfield and Doctor VVeston, vrged him much about the place, asking him where was the miracle, yf Christ left his flesh heere only in mystery and by faith; how could the comparison stand betweene *Helias* and *Christ*? for *Christ* must do more then *Elias*; *Elias* left his mantle and could not carry yt vp with him; *Christ* not only left his flesh, but carryed vp the same, ergo he left the same that he carryed vp, &c. But he carryed vp his true and naturall flesh, ergo he left the same; to all which he aunswered againe: He tooke vp his flesh vvith him to heauen, and left heere the communion of his flesh on earth. With which shiftinge aunswere Doctor VVeston being moued, began after his fashion to vrge the matter earnestly sayinge: yow vnderstand in the first place his flesh for very true flesh, and in the second place for grace and communion of his flesh, I will make yt euident how blockish and grosse your aunswere is: As *Elias* left his cloke (saith *S. Chrysostome*) so the sonne of God left his flesh; but *Elias* left his true substantiall cloke, ergo *Christ* left his true substantiall flesh: and heerin he spake in English. Ridly. I am glad yow speake in English, and surely I vvould vvish all the vvorld might vnderstand your reasons and my answers: Reliquit nobis carnem, *Christ* left vnto vs his flesh: This yow vnderstand of flesh, and I vnderstand of grace: he carryed his flesh to heauen, and left behind him the communion of his flesh vnto vs. Weston. Yee iudges

Chrysost.
hom. 2. ad
Pop. Antioch.

what

what thinke yow of this, aunswere Iudges. Iudges.
It is a ridiculous, and very fond aunswere. Ridley.
well I will take your vvords patiently for Christs sake.
52. And this was the end of the controuersy
about this place of *S. Chrysostome*, to witt,
that we must take grace for flesh, and when
Christ is said to haue left his flesh heere with
vs, we must vnderstand his grace: Yet Doctor
Vveston alleaged also another place out of the
same Father, where he saith: *Spargimur, &c.*
VVe are sprinkled vvith the very selfe-same bloud,
that Christ carryed vp vvith him, &c. Whervnto
Ridley answered after his fashon: *yt is the same*
bloud, but spiritually receaued. Then vrged he *Saint*
Bernards words againe; *the selfe-same Christ is pre-*
sent vvholly in diuers places, euen from the vvest to the
east, from the north to the south, &c. Wherto Ridley
aunswere; *that God accordinge to his Maiestie and*
prouidence, as S. Augustine saith, is euery-where with
the faithfull, and so must Bernard be expounded. Do
yow see this exposition? Read *Saint Bernards*
words before sett downe, and yow shall see,
that he speaketh of Christ, *as sittinge in heauen,*
and yet present vvholly in the Priests hands, &c.
And not of his Maiestie & prouidence, wher-
by he is euery-where, as before hath byn de-
clared: So as this is not to expound, but to
confound the Fathers, and I thinke verily that
Ridley was much troubled, when he gaue such
impertinent aunswers and expositions.

53. And with this would I passe ouer this
whole strife about *Saint Chrysostomes* places of
Elias, but that I must let yow know, that there

had byn some yeares before, a great styrre and altercation in the conuocation-house about the same, for that *Philpott* hearinge that place alleaged against him, as his fashon was, vaunted wonderfully, that this being the Papists cheefe and principall foundation, he would so beat them from yt, and (as Fox addeth), *giue such a plucke at yt, as yt should neuer serue their turne more*: and when yt came to the triall, he said that he had two wayes to beate them from it: The first was, that Christ goinge vp to heauen carryed his owne flesh with him, and left the same behind him, *in that he left vs behind him, that are flesh of his flesh and bones of his bones*. This is the first blow and plucke, wherby yow see, that Christs progiatue is plucked also; for *Helias* as well as he left his flesh behind him in this sense, for he was of our flesh: and *Philpott* also left his flesh behind him in vs, though his owne were burned in Smith-field. And finally *S. Chrysostome* speaketh expressely of the Sacrament of the Altar, sayinge: that therein Christ left his flesh, but he did not leaue all mankynd in that Sacrament; wherfore this first plucke is to small purpose. But lett vs see his second.

Two
pluckles of
Philpott
prayed
by Fox.

54. The second is, *that Christ* (saith he) *left his flesh in the mysteryes, that is sacramentally; and that this mysticall flesh, Christ leaueth as well in the Sacrament of baptisme, as in the sacramentall bread & wine*. So he. Wherin (yf yow marke) he giueth not only the ordinary old plucke of other Sacramentaryes, to the verity of Christs flesh, makinge

kinge that mysticall, which *S. Chrysostome* speaketh expressely of the naturall flesh left by him, and therby plucketh out of ioint all *Saint Chrysostomes* whole meaninge and discourse, but giueth a new plucke also to the whole Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, affirminge Christs flesh to be as much in baptisme, as in the other, & consequently that both *Saint Chrysostome*, and other Fathers, do in vayne trouble themselues, with so much extolling the excellency of the *Eucharist* for hauinge Christs flesh in yt, for that the water of baptisme hath the same, & so yow see the whole Sacrament plucked vp by these pluckes of *Philpott*, and yet (saith Fox) that he did shrewdly shake our reall presence, by giuinge such a plucke to one of our cheefe foundations. Yow see how one of these men do flatter the other.

The absurdities
of *Philpott*.

Fox pag.
1294

55. Next to this entred one *Maister VVard* to dispute that had byn *Philpotts* reader, and seing *D. Ridley* to haue doubted so much in grauntinge and denyinge Christs body to haue appeared vpon earth, as in the former disputations of *Doctor Smith*, yow haue partly heard, though much be omitted for breuityes sake, he began to vrge him againe in that point, alleaginge against him the authority of a Catechisme sett forth by himselfe, in the name of the whole conuocation-house in *K. Edwards* dayes, where the selfe-same point is graunted, which heere he denied; but *Ridley* for two or three abouts, would not yeld that the Catechisme was his, though the iudges said that

M. VVard
disputeth.

Fox pag.
1317.

Cranmer had confessed the matter the day before, and Maister VVard auouched to his face, that he being Bishop of London, & in his ruffe, compelled him to subscribe therunto; yet at length he confessed, that both he and Cranmer had approued the same vnder their hands, & that the place alleaged against him, might easily be expounded without any incōuenience; and so they flydd away from that matter, and a place of Theophilact came in question, where he wryteth, that Christ in the institution of the Sacrament of the Altar *non dixit, hoc est figu-*

Theoph.
comment. m
24. Matth.

ra corporis mei, sed hoc est corpus meum: he said not, that this is the figure of my body, but this is my body: which authority Ridley wiped of by sayinge his meaninge to be, that yt was *not only a figure of his body*. Wherevnto Doctor VVeston replied, that this *only* was *one lye* put in by him, for that Theophilact had no such word, nor could yt stand with his sense, for that he did not make the opposition betweene *figure*, and *only*, but betweene the *body* and *figure*, sayinge; *yt vvas his body, and not a figure of his body*. And for prooffe of this, another place of Theophilact was alleaged vpon Saint Iohn, where his words are: *quoniam infirmi sumus, &c.* for that vve are infirme, and abhorre to eate raw-flesh especially the flesh of man, therefore yt appeared bread, but is flesh: what can be more plaine, and perspicuous then this? and yet do I not find any annswere to haue byn giuen by Doctor Ridley to this place, but that he passed to another matter, to expound the word *Transubstantiated* vsed by Theophilact. And I passe

Theoph. in
cap. 6. Iohn.

pasſe ouer ditters other places, as that of Ter-
tullian, *acceptum panem corpus suum illud fecit*: he
takinge bread made yt his body; and that of
Iustinius Martyr, sayinge: That Christs flesh in the Sa-
crament, is the same that vvas taken of the blessed Vir-
gin. And that of S. Augustine vpon the Psalm; *that he gaue vs to eat the selfe same flesh, wherein he*
vwalked vpon earth. All which places being ob-
iecte before to Cranmer, and read both then
& now out of the authors themselves, by Do-
ctor VVeston that had the books by him, were
no otherwise answered heere, then by the
same shifts which Cranmer had auoyded them
before, yt appearinge evidently that they had
agreed vpon certayne distinctions, and com-
mon euasions, wherby to delude all the Fa-
thers authorities that might be brought a-
gainst them, though they were neuer so cleere
or pregnant for the purpose.

56. It followeth, that by order of disputation
the turne came to Doctor Glyn to dispute against
Doctor Ridley, who made (saith Fox) a very con-
tumelious preface against him, vvhich Ridley
tooke the more to heart, for that he had allwayes taken
him to be his friend. And albeit Fox doth not sett
downe the same preface, yet by Doctor Glyns
entrance to his argument, a man may see, that
the cheefe point was in reprehendinge him,
for deludinge and shiftinge of both scriptures
and fathers so shamfully, as he had heard him
do, for he saith: *I see that you euade or shift away*
all scriptures & fathers. And Ridley answered: *this*
is a greivous contumely, that you call me a shifter, &c.

And

Tert. lib. 4.
cont. Mar-
cion.

Iust. Mart.
in Apol. 2.

Aug. in
Psalm. 96.

D. Glyns
argument
about
vvorship-
pinge the
Sacramēt.

Fox pag.
1319.

And finally Doctor Glyn endeauored to draw him to yeld to the Catholike Church, which being the pillar of truth, could not be thought to haue fallen to such Idolatry, as for many ages to haue worshipped erroneously bread and wyne, for the flesh and bloud of Christ in the Eucharist, and for prooffe therof he alleaged *Saint Augustine* against *Faustin the Manichee*, where he saith, that this vse of adoring Christs body in the Sacrament, was so auncient and publike, as some pagans did thinke that Christians did adore *Ceres* and *Bacchus* the Gods of bread and wyne. He alleaged also *Erasmus* authority, who affirmeth that this worshipping, and adoration of the Sacrament of the Altar, was in vse before the tyme of *S. Augustine* and *S. Cyprian*; which is not so in the Sacrament of Baptisme, though *Ridley* affirme there is as much the flesh of Christ, as in the other, and consequently, there is some speciall cause in the *Eucharist* aboue other Sacraments. To which two authorities I find nothinge answered particularly; (as neyther to *Erasmus*) but to the thing it selfe *Ridley* answered: *VVe do handle the signes reuerently, &c.* And againe: *There is a deceyt in this word Adoramus, we adore, for vve vvorshipp the symbolles, vvhen reuerently vve handle them: vve vvorshipp vvhersoever vve perceauē benefitts.* Whervnto Doctor Glyn answered: *So I might fall downe before the bench heere, and worshipp Christ therein, &c.* For a bench also is a beneficiall creature to them that sitt on yt. But for all this no further satisfaction could be had,

but

*Aug. cont.
Faust. Ma-
nich 1. 20.
cap. 13.*

*Erasm. in
ep. ad frat.
infer.
Gryn.*

but that all the adoe which the Fathers do make, about the highest honour in earth to be giuen to the Sacrament of the Altar, comes to no more by these mens interpretations; but that the signes of bread and wyne must be reuerently handled, & Christ absent must be vvorshipped therein, as in other thinges, vvherin vve perceauē or receauē his benefitts: vvwhich indeed are all his creatures made & ordayned for our profit, for by them all, we perceauē & receauē Christs benefitts: So as all these great admirations of the Fathers, about the honour, worshipp & adoration due to this Sacrament, come to no more in effect, but that vve must reuerence Christ therin, as in other his beneficiall creatures, and vvorshipp the symbol of bread and wyne, as much as yow do the water in baptisme: vvwhich yet neuer any of the Fathers said was to be adored by vs (as they do of the Eucharist) though Baptisme be a most necessary and profitable Sacrament.

57. Then disputed one Doctor Curtopp, allea-
ginge a place out of S. Chrysostome, affirminge:
that which is in the cupp, or chalice, to be the same blood
(after the words of consecration) *that flowed*
from the side of Christ, wherof he inferred, that
true and naturall blood did flow from the side
of Christ, ergo true and naturall blood was in
the chalice. To this Ridley answered in effect
after his ould fashion, that yt was true blood,
that is to say, the Sacrament of his blood. Curtopp.
The Sacrament of the blood is not the blood. Ridley.
The Sacrament of the blood, is the blood, and that is at-
tributed to the Sacrament, vvwhich is spoken of the thing
of the

D. Curtopp
argued.

Chrysost.
hom. 24. in
1. Cor. 10.

Fox pag.
1319.

of the Sacrament. At which aunswere D. VVeston being moued, as yt seemed, argued in English (saith Fox) thus: That vyhich is in the chalice is the same that flowed out of Christs side, but there came out very true blood, ergo there is very true blood in the chalice. Ridley. The blood of Christ is in the chalice in deed, but not in the reall presence, but by grace and in a Sacrament. Weston. That is very vvell; then vve haue blood in the chalice. Ridley. It is true, but by grace, and in a Sacrament; and heere the people hissed at him, (saith Fox) wherat Ridley said: O my maisters I take this for no iudgement, I will stand to Gods iudgement. This was his last refuge and further then this, nothinge could be had at his hands.

D. VVatson
disputeth.

58. There rose vp after this Doct^r VVatson, who after a long altercation with Ridley, whether after consecration the Sacrament might be called true bread: Ridley alleaged this place of S. Paul. The bread which we breake, is yt not a communication of the body of Christ? As though yt had made for him. But VVatson brought S. Chrysostomes expositiō: Quare non dixit participationē, &c. VVherfore did not S. Paul say heere, that yt is the participation (of Christs body) but the communication? because he would signify some greater matter, & that he vould declare a great conuenience betwene the same, for that vve do not communicate by participation only & receauing, but by co-vniting or vnion; for euen as the body is co-vnited to Christ; so also are we by the same bread conioyned and vnited to him. Out of which place of S. Chrysostome, yt appeareth euidently, that his beleefe was; that as his body and flesh

was

was really vnited to his person, so are we vn-
to him in flesh, by eatinge the same in the Sa-
crament, which is another manner of vnion
then by faith and generall only. But to this
lett vs heare *Ridleyes* aunswere in his owne
words: *Ridleye. Let Chrysostome haue his manner*
of speakinge, and his sentence, yf yt be true, I reiect yt
not, but lett yt not be preiudiciall to me, to name yt
bread. So he. And thus vvas *S. Chrysostome* shif-
ted of, neyther admitted, nor fully reiecte;
but if he spake truly, then was he to be credited, which
was a courteous kind of reiection; for *Ridley*
would haue the reader beleue, that he spake
not truly. And so much for him.

Fox pag.
1320.

59. And so when nothinge more could be
gotten by *Doctor VVatson* from *Maister Ridley* in
this argument, *Doctor Smith* stepped in to him
again, and vrge a place of *S. Augustine* vpon
the thirty and third Psalme: *Ferebatur in mani-*
bus suis, &c. He was carryed in his owne hands,
applyed by *S. Austen* to *Christ*: his words are:
Hoc quo modo fieri possit in homine, quis intelligat?
Who can vnderstand how this can be done
by a man? for that no man is borne by his owne hands,
but by other mens hands, neyther can vve find how this
was fullfilled literally in *K. Dauid*, but by *Christ* we find
it fullfilled, for that *Christ* was borne in his owne hands;
when he said this is my body, for he did become that bo-
dy in his owne hands, &c. And againe in another
sermon vpon the same place, he repeateth a-
gain the very same thinge sayinge: *How vvas*
Christ borne in his owne hands? for that vwhen he did
commend vnto vs his body and bloud, he tooke into his
hands

1. Reg. 31.

Aug. in
Psalm. 33.
conclusion 1.

Aug. ibid.
concl. 2.

hands that vvhich the faithfull knew, and so he bare himselfe after a certayne manner, vvhhen he said this is my body. Out of which places appeareth euidently, that *S. Augustine* beleeeued, that Christ after the words of consecration vttered, did beare his owne body in his hands, and that this in his iudgement was so miraculous a thinge, as neyther *King Dauid*, nor any other mortall man could do yt, but only Christ, which yet is not so in a figure (for euery man may beare a figure of his owne body in his hands) and furthermore yt is cleere by these authorities, and by those words (*nōrunt fideles*) that this was the beleefe by all faithfull people of *S. Austens* tyme. Which argument being much vrged against *Maister Ridley*, both by *Doctor Smith* and others, he sought to declyne the force therof dyuers-wayes, as saying first; that *S. Augustine* vvent from others in this exposition, (but yet named none) and then, that this place of scripture vvas read otherwise of other men, accordinge to the hebrew text, & other like euasions, which yet proue not (as yow see) but that *Saint Austen* was of this opinion and beleefe himselfe, (which is the question in this place) and after all this he passed to his ordinary refuge, that Christ bare himselfe sacramentally only, and not otherwise; laying hands, for some shew of reason, vpon the word *quodammodo*, vsed in the second place by *S. Austen*, that is, after a certayne manner. And when it was replied to him, that *S. Austen* vsed that word, to shew the different manner of his being in the Sacrament, and out of the

Sacra-

Sacrament, but that otherwayes all parts and circumstances of *S. Austens* speech do shew, that he beleueed Christ to haue holden really, and truly his owne body and flesh in his hands, they could gett no other aunswere from him but this: *He did beare himselfe, but in a Sacrament.* Fox pag. 1321. Wherat men maruaylinge, *Doctor Smith* said: *You are holden fast, nor are ye able to escape out of this labyrinth.* And then began *Doctor Tressam* to pray for him with a sollemne prayer, which being ended he said: *If there were an Arrian beere that had this subtile witt, that you haue, he might soone shift of the scriptures, and Fathers as you doe.* Wherat *Doctor Vveston*, seeming vnwilling that tyme should be spent in prayinge and not in disputinge, said: *eyther dispute, or hould your peace I pray you.* And with this they passed to another disputation, *whether euill men do receaue the true body of Christ or not:* But *S. Austen* authority of bea- ringe himselfe in his hands, gatt no other so- lution, but that Christ bare himselfe in his hands, that is the figure or representation of himselfe, which neither *Dauid*, nor other mor- tall man could do: At which absurdity most of the audience did laugh.

60. But concerninge the other questions, *whether euill men do receaue Christ*, *Doctor Tressam* D. Tressam disputeth. brought two or three places out of *S. Austen* concerninge *Iudas*, that he eat the true body of Christ, as the other Apostles did, and then againe of wicked men in generall: *Quia aliquis non ad salutem manducat, non ideo non est corpus:* Aug. lib. 4. cont. Donat. cap. 3. be- cause some do not eate to saluation, yt fol- loweth

loweth not therfore, that yt is not his body: but to all this Maister Ridley aunswered by his former shifte, that yt is the body to them, that is, the Sacrament of the body. Do yow see the fond euasion? there was no doubt or question whether euill men did eat the Sacrament, or externall forme, (for euery man doth eat that, when they receaue) but the question was and is of the true body: and therfore when Saint Austen speaketh of this body, yt is madnes to vnderstand yt of any other thinge, then the reall body. But lett vs heare what was replyed: Doctor VVeston said: I bringe Theophilact against yow: Iudas (saith he) gustauit carnem Domini: Iudas did eate or tast the flesh of Christ. Ridley. That is the Sacrament of the Lords flesh. Doctor VVatson replyed out of the Councell of Nice:

Fox *ibid.*
num. 49.

Concil. Ni-
ces primum
tit. de eue-
namento
et c. ultimum
editionis.

Exaltata mente fideliter credamus, iacere in illa sacra-
mensa agnum Dei tollentem peccata mundi, a sacerdo-
tibus sacrificatum. Let vs faithfully beleeeue with
an exalted mynd, that there lyeth in the holy
„ table the lambe of God, that taketh away the
„ sinnes of the world, which is sacrificed by the
„ Priests. Ridley. That Councell vvas collected out of

Fox *ibid.*

anncient Fathers, and is to me of great authority, &c. the vvords make for me: the lambe of God is in heauen accordinge to the verity of the body, and heere he is with vs in a mystery accordinge to his power, not corporally. Watson. But the lambe of God lyeth on the table. Ridley. It is a figuratiue speech, for in our mynd we vnderstand him vvich is in heauen. Watson. But he lyeth there, the Greeke vvord is κείτῃ. Ridley. He lyeth there, that is, he is there present, not corporally.

but

but he lyeth there in his operation, &c. And by this yow may see, to what purpose yt was to dispute with this man; for that God by his power and operation is euery where; and in euery creature. And yf Christ be no otherwise heere, but by his power and operation, as in baptisme, what an impertinency is this of the Counticell of Nice, to vse so many and significant words, that vve must faithfully beleene with a high mynd and courage, against sense and reason; that the lambe of God lyeth on the table sacrificed by Priests, and the like; Is there any Protestant that speaketh thus, or can the like words be verified in the Protestants communion, of signes, figures, representations and symbolles? 61. Lastly to skipp ouer diuers other things, Doctor VVeston pressed him with two other places of S. Chrysostome, so cleere, as nothinge can be spoken more cleerer. The first is in these words: vve vvorshipp the selfe same body in the Eucharist, which the vvise men did vvorshipp in the manger. And then againe: vve haue not heere the Lord in the manger, but on the Altar; heere a vvoman holdeth him not in her hands, but a Priest. These are the words. Let vs heare his answer. Ridley. I graunt the Priest holdeth the same thinge, but after another manner. She did hold the naturall body, the Priest holdeth the mystery of the body. So hee. And Fox wryteth in the margent. The same thinge, but the manner diuerse. But who seeth not, that our contention is about the thing, and not the manner; for we reach also that the manner of Christs being in the Sacrament, is different

Fox pag.
1321.

Chrysost.
hom. 24. in
1. ad Cor.

Fox pag.
1322.

Ridley in
vvords
vvil seeme
to agree.

from the manner of his being in heauen, butt the thinge really is all one. And so yf Ridley do graunt the same thinge to be holden by the Priest hands, which the blessed virgin held in her hands, as heere yow see him graunt in words, then the controuersie betweene vs and him is ended. But presently he leapeth from his graunt againe, sayinge she did hold the naturall body, and the Priest holdeth the mystery of the body, which are different things, and not only different manners of holdinge. Wherefore Doctor Vveston repeatinge againe this argument out of *S. Chrysostome* to the multitude in English (saith Iohn Fox) and consideringe the manner of *Ridleyes* aunswereinge, and that nothings more could be had of him, he dissolued the disputation in these words: *Videtis prae fracti hominis animum, gloriosum, rasum, inconstantem, &c.* Yow see the stubborne, vauntinge, deceytfull, and inconstant mynd of this man. And with this Encomion departed Doctor Ridley to his prison againe, and the other Doctors each man to their owne lodgings.

Out of the Disputations with M. Hugh Latimer, together with the conclusion of the whole triall in this article. §. 4.

64. Vpon the third day being wednesday the

the 18. of Aprill, was brought forth Maister Hugh Latymer to aunswere as the former had done, but the disputation was much more shorter then the other, and in English, for Maister Latymer (saith Fox) *alleged that he was out of use with Latyn, and unfit for that place.* He gaue vp his confession about the three articles in wrytinge, after the imitation of Cranmer and Ridley, full of scoffes and bitter taunts, as his veyne was, and rested most vpon the masse, and the *four marrow-bones* therof (for so blasphemously he called them) which were (forsooth) *consecration, transubstantiation, oblation, and adoration*, of all which yow haue heard the ancient Fathers speeches before, how different they are from these of Latymer, as was also their spirit.

Fox pag.
1322.

Latymer 4.
morrovv-
bones of
the masse.

63. The first entrance to talke betwene Maister Latymer, and the Doctors was, for that he sayinge in his wrytinge, that nothinge was to be receaued concerning the Sacramēt, which was not expressely sett downe in the institution of Christ, Doctor Vveston inferred, that then weomen must not receaue the communion, for that no expresse mention is made in scripture of their receauinge; and when Latymer aunswered, that S. Paul said: *Probet autem seipsum homo*, which signifieth said he both men and weomen, yt was replyed, that in Greeke yt was *anthropos* that was proper to man, &c. Then Doctor Vveston asked him, how longe he had byn of this opinion? he said about some seauen yeares (he being more then seauenty

of age) and that my L. of Canterburyes booke had specially confirmed his iudgement therein. And yf (quoth he) I could remember all therein conteyned, I wvould not feare to aunswere any man in this matter. So he. And many tymes after he ran still to this booke of Cranmer. My Lord of Canterburyes booke (saith he to an argument of Doctor Cartwright) handleth this very vvell, and by him could I aunswere yow, yf I had him. And againe in another place to another argument. The solution of this (saith he) is in my Lord of Canterbury his booke. And yet further to another. I remember I haue read this in my Lord of Canterburyes booke. Wherto Doctor Tressam aunswered, that there are in that booke six hundred lyes, but Latymer replied nothinge, &c.

Fox pag.
1325.

Latymer
foundeth
himselfe
on Cran-
mers
booke.

Lath. l. de
missa Priua-
ta fol. 14.
Contrary

64. Then said Doctor VVeston: Yow vvere once a Lutheran. Latimer. No I vvas a Papist, for I could neuer perceaue how Luther could defend his opinion, vvithout transubstantiation. The Tygurines once did vvryte a booke against Luther, and I oft desired God that he might liue so longe as to make them aunswere. So he, wherby is seene, that he fauoured Luther more then the Tygurines at that tyme, for that he would haue had them aunswered. But Doctor VVeston said further: Luther in his booke de priuata missa, testifieth that the diuell reasoned vvith him, and perswaded him that the masse vvas not good, vvherby yt appeareth that Luther said masse, and the diuell dissuaded him from yt. Latimer. I do not take in hand heere to defend Luthers sayings or doings: yf he vvere heere, he wvould defend himselfe vvell inough I trow. So Latymer, leauinge Luther to him-
selfe,

selfe, but Fox will needs defend him with this marginall note sayinge: *In that booke, the diuell doth not dissuade him so much from sayinge masse, as to bring him to desperation for sayinge masse, such temptations many tymes happen to good men.* Fox pag. 1324.

65. And will yow consider the grauity and verity of this note; first he saith that the diuell did not so much dissuade him from sayinge masse, as to bringe him to desperation: then somewhat he did dissuade him, though not so much as to the other; which I belecue, for that the one was his damnation, and his leauinge of masse was but the way to yt. Secondly yf the diuell did endeauour to bringe Luther to desperation for sayinge of masse, he must needs persuaide him first, that the masse was naught, as yf he would draw a man to desperation for vsing almes-deeds, he must first persuaide him, that almes-deeds are naught and wicked, and as wise a man as he should shew himselfe, that at the diuells persuasion will beleue that almes-deeds were naught, and leaue the same; so were Luther & Latymer as wise to beleue this suggestion of the diuell against the masse. And where Fox saith, *that such temptations of the diuell do happen many tymes to good-men.* I graunt yt, but not that euer any good man did yeld therevnto, or iudge a thinge euill, for that the diuell did say yt was naught, but rather to the contrary, his impugnation of yt is alwayes a signe, that the thing is good and pleasinge to almighty God, whose aduersary the diuell is; yea the greater
his

John Fox
excuseth
the diuell
and accuseth
Luther.

The diuells
impugninge
of the
masse as
euill, pro-
ueth yt to
be God,

his impugnation is, the better must we presume the thing to be, and consequently when he would make the masse to seeme so heynous a thinge to Luther, as that he should be damned for sayinge the same, yt is a good prooffe that the masse is an excellent thing, & displeaseth the diuell, and that Luther and his followers leauing to say masse, do please much the diuell in followinge his suggestion therin, as good and obedient children, to so holy a ghostly Father, and so to him we leaue them.

66. There followeth, that albeit *Latymer* was loath to dispute, yet some few arguments were cast forth against him, but all in English, for so he would haue yt. And first *Maister Doctor Tressam* alleaged an authority of *Saint Hilary*, affirminge a naturall vnity to be in vs with Christ by eatinge his flesh. Which place, for that yt was alleaged before against his fellowes, I will not stand much vpon yt, but only note this mans euasion: *Latymer*. *I can not speake Latyn so longe, &c.* But as for the words (saith he) of *Hilary*, I thinke they make not so much for yow: but he that should answer the Doctors, had not neede to be in my case, but should haue them in a readynesse, and know their purpose: *Melancthon* saith, that if the Doctors had for seene, that they should haue byn so taken in this controuersie, they would haue vrryten more plainly. This was his answer, and more then this yow shall not find, and in this, there is a notable imposture of an old deceauer, for that *Melancthon* being of opposite opinion to him in this article, and wrytinge a whole worke of the Doctors sentences

tences

tences for prooffe of the *reall-presence*, against the Sacramentaryes, as in his * life we haue shewed, what he speaketh of this mystakinge the Fathers and Doctores, he speaketh expressly of the Sacramentaryes, and not of those that defend the *reall-presence*, which he also, being a Lutheran, defended, and affirmeth plainly that all the Fathers are of the same opinion, though yf they had foreseene, that such heretiks, as are the Sacramentaryes, would haue risen vp, and haue wrested their words and meaning (as yow haue heard both *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latymer* to haue done) they would haue spoken more plainly in the controuersie, though hardly they could haue spoken more cleerly against them. And by this first entrance, yow may marke the plaine dealinge of old Father *Latymer*.

67. Doctor *Seaton* Vice-chancelour of Cambridge, seing these sleights of the old fellow, be-
ginneeth thus with him: I know your learninge
voll enough, and how subtile yow be: I will vse a few
words vvith yow out of *S. Cyprian*, vvho saith, that the
old Testament doth forbidd the drinkinge of bloud, and
the new Testament doth commaund the drinkinge of
bloud. Out of which words he framed this ar-
gument. That yt vvas true and reall bloud, vvhich the
old Testament forbadd to drinke, ergo yt is true and
reall bloud vvhich the new Testament commaundeth to
drinke; for that otherwise the antithesis or oppo-
sition of the two Testamets in this point can
not hold, yf the one forbidd the true drinking
of true and reall bloud, and the other com-

* Mensa
Decembri.

Fox pag.
1325.

D. Seaton's
argument
Cyp. de
Can. Dom.

Fox pag.
1325.

Aug. tract.
25. in Ioan.

Heb. 13.

S. Cyprian
place vr-
ged by P.
VWeston.

Fox pag.
1325. col. 1.
num. 27.

maundeth the figuratiue drinking of spiritual
bloud by faith; for that these things are oppo-
site, and that the Iewes also in the old Testa-
ment did drinke Christs bloud by faith, &c.
To which argument *Latymer* answered no-
thing in effect; but this; *vve do tast true bloud,*
but spiritually, and this is enough. And then proueth
he the same by those words of *S. Augustine* be-
fore answered by vs; *crede & manducasti*; be-
leeue, & thou hast eaten, as though the words
credere and *edere*, were all one in the scriptures.
Whervpon *Doctor VWeston* recyted a story that
passed betwene *Maister Hooper* and *B. Gardener*;
for when *Hooper* would needs hould, that to
eate was to beleue, and that an *Altar* signified
Christ in the scriptures, *B. Gardener* inferred,
ergo, when *S. Paul* saith to the Hebrewes, that
vve haue an Altar, vvhether of the Iewes must not eat: the
sense is, vve haue Christ; in whome the Iewes must not
beleue. And after this he returned to presse
Latymer strongly againe vpon this place of *S.*
Cyprian; sayinge: *that is commaunded in the new*
Testament, vvhich is forbidden in the old, but true
bloud vvas forbidden in the old, ergo true bloud also is
commaunded to be drunken in the new. Whervnto
Latymer answeringe twise, vttered two con-
traries: for first his words are: *It is true as tou-*
chinge the matter; but not as touchinge the manner of
the thinge, where he graunteth (as yow see) that
true bloud is meant in both Testaments, but
the manner of drinkinge is different, which
also we graunt & teach: but heare his second
answere vpon the other instance.

98. Weston. *The old Testament doth forbidd the tastinge of bloud, but the new doth commaund yt.* Latymer. *It is true, not as touchinge the thinge, but as touchinge the manner therof.* Before he said: yt is true touchinge the matter, but not touchinge the manner; now he saith; yt is true touching the manner and not touchinge the thinge: so as yf the *thinge and matter* be all one, as yt is, he speaketh contraries. Whervpon Doctor VVeston opened the whole argument to the people in English, and the absurdity of his answer, but Latymer replied againe and againe; *that true bloud vvas commaunded spirituallly to be drunken in the new Testament.* Whervnto one Doctor Pye replied, and objected, that yt was not forbidden to be drunken spirituallly in the old law: for that (saith he) *they drinke spirituallly Christs bloud in the old law, ergo, the drinkinge therof in the new must be more then only spirituall.* To this Latymer answered, *the substance of bloud is drunken, but not in one manner.* So as heere yow see, he graunteth also the substance of bloud to be drunken, though in a different manner from that of the old Testament. But being pressed by the said Doctor Pye, that we require not the same manner of drinkinge bloud in the new law, which was forbidden in the old; but only that yt is as really and truly bloud, as the other was; his finall aunswere and resolution is this, *It is the same thinge, but not the same manner, I haue no more to say.* Heere then is his last determination, and consider I pray yow the substance therof; yf yt be the same thinge, then must

Fox ibid.
num. 70.

D. Pye
disputeth.

must yt needs be really and truly blood; for this is the thinge or matter wherof the question is, for that otherwayes we know that the blood forbidden in the old Testament, is meant the blood of beasts, and the blood commaunded in the new, is meant of the blood of Christ; So as in this, *Latymer* cannot graunt them to be one thinge, but only in the reallity and truth of blood, that is, as the one is true and reall blood of beasts: so is the other true and reall blood of Christ; which yf he graunt (as heere in words he doth) then cannot the different manner of drinkinge the same alter the substance of the thinge yt selfe; or yf yt do, then is yt false, that yt is the same thinge; and so euery way is ould *Latymer* taken, but lett vs passe forewatd.

69. *Doctor VVeston* to confirme the reallity of Christs blood, receaued in the Sacrament, alleaged another place of *S. Chrysostome*, where talkinge of *Iudas* he saith, *Christus ei sanguinem quem vendidit offerebat*. Christ gaue him (in the Sacrament, to witt, to *Iudas*) the blood which he had sould. Can any thinge be playner spoken. *Latymer* answered: he gaue to *Iudas* his blood, in a Sacrament, and by this thinketh he hath said somewhat to the purpose, wheras indeed he saith nothinge. For we say also, that he gaue him his blood in a Sacrament, as we say, that we giue wyne in a cuppe, but this excludeth not the reality of the blood, no more then the giuinge in a cupp, or vnder a veyle, taketh away the true reality of the wyne; yet is this

*Chrysost.
serm. de
Produs.
Iude.*

the

the common hole for Sacramentaryes to runne out at, when they are pressed; for both they and we do agree, that Christs blood is giuen in the Sacrament vnder a signe sacramentally, and the like phrases; but the difference betweene vs is, that we by this do not exclude the truth & reality of the thing therein conteyned, as they do, & therby delude both themselves and others, speakinge in such sort, as they cannot be vnderstood, but only that a man may easily vnderstand, that they seeke therby euasions, and wayes to slipp out at.

70. I passe ouer diuers other authorities of Fathers alleaged by the Doctores, as those words of S. Cyrill: *Per communionem corporis Christi, habitat in nobis Christus corporaliter.* By the communion of Christs body, he dwelleth in vs corporally, *ergo*, not spiritually only and by faith. Latymer aunswere; first that (corporally) hath another vnderstandinge, then you do grossely take yt. And then being pressed againe, he said: *The solution of this is in my Lord of Canterburys booke.* So he. But Fox not contented, (as it seemeth) with this aunswere, putteth downe a larger, though without an author, wherby we may conceaue yt to be his owne. Corporally (saith he) is to be taken heere in the same sense, that S. Paul saith, the fullnes of diuinity to dwell corporally in Christ, that is, not lighty, nor accidentally, but perfectly & substantially, &c. Which answere yf Fox will stand vnto we are agreed; for we require no more but that Christ by the commnion of his body in the Sacrament, doth dwell perfectly

Cyrrill. l. 10.
in cap. 13.
loan.

Fox pag.
1325.

fectly and substantially in vs, for that importeth also really, as the fullnesse of diuinity is really in Christ incarnate, and not by vnion only of will, as the *Arrians* said, and as our Sacramentaries do talke of Christs vnion only by faith in vs. And lett the reader note by the way *John Fox* his witt, & deepe diuinity, who knowinge not what he saith, graunteth by this example more then we require; for he graunteth the same substantiall vnity to be betweene Christ and our soule, which is betweene Christs diuinity, and his humanity, which is false; ours being accidentall and separable; the other substantiall & inseparable, for that yt is hypostaticall. But these things *John* had not learned, and so we pardon him, and do returne to *Latymer* againe, who being vrged hardly by *Doctor Smith* about *Saint Cyrills* words; that Christ by communion of his body in the Sacrament dwelleth corporally in vs, ergo, not only spiritually by faith; he answered: I say both that he dwelleth in vs spiritually, and corporally, spiritually by faith, and corporally by takinge our flesh vpon him; for I remember that I haue read this in my *Lord of Canterburyes booke*. Heere now yow see another shift different from that of *Fox*, authorised by my *L. of Canterburyes booke*, but shaken of by *S. Cyrills booke*, which saith expressly as yow haue heard, that Christ dwelleth in vs corporally by the communion of his body in the Sacrament, and talketh not of the incarnation.

71. Wherefore *Doctor VVeston* seing that more could not be had of *Latymer* in this point, he

passed

passed
with
sing
grac
list;
auth
read
there
a non
narr
Fox
the f
thor
them
aunf
stor
may
temp
ders.
finua
leag
whe
byn
Laty
aunf
fostom
his la
might
thing
this f
res leg
read
sense

passed to another matter, which was to deale with him about the *Sacrifice of che masse*. In scoffing against which, *Latymers* grace, or disgrace rather and sinne, did principally consist; and so alleaginge many auncient Fathers authorities against him for this purpose, and reading the places at length, hauing the books there present, *Latmyer* was quickly dryuen to a *non-plus*, as may appeare by Fox his owne narration, though he setteth yt downe like a Fox indeed, suppressinge all the particulars of the said places, but only the names of the authors, and the first words of the texts, and not them also in all. And then toucheth he the answers of *Latmyer*, and the Catholike Doctors replies so brokenly and confusedly, as may easily shew that he would declyne the tempest of that combat from *Latymers* shoulders, and not haue the matter vnderstood, insinuatinge only some 8. or 9. authorities alleaged for prooffe of the propitiatory sacrifice, whereas more then 8. or 9. score might haue byn cyted to that effect. And finally though *Latmyer* muttered out two or three particular answers heere and there, sayinge; that *S. Chrysostome* had *Emphaticall locutions*, and the like; yet his last rest was sett vpon this; that the Doctors might be deceaued in some points, though not in all things: Wherof Fox well allowinge, maketh this scoffinge comment in the margent, *Doctores legendi sunt cum venia*; the Doctors are to be read with pardon, which can haue no other sense, but that eyther we must pardon them, when

when they speake not truth, or we must aske pardon of them, not to beleue them when we mislike them; for other sense I cannot make of this comentary.

The last
colloquii
with La-
tymer.

For *ibid.*

27. Doctor Cole replied; is it not a shame for an old man to lye? you say you are of the old Fathers faith. Latymer. I am of their faith vwhen they say well, I referre my selfe to my Lord of Caterburyes booke wholly herin Doctor Smith. Then you are not of S. Chrysostomes faith, nor S. Augustines faith. Latymer. I haue said, vwhen they say vwell, and bring scriptures for them, I am of their faith, and further Augustine requi- reth not to be beleued, &c. Weston. Forty yeares gone, vwhether could you haue gone to haue found your doctrine? Latym. The more cause we haue to thanke God now, that hath sent the light into the vworld. Weston. The light? ney light and lewd preachers, &c. remember vwhat they haue bin; that haue bin the be- ginners of your doctrine, none but a few flyinge Aposta- tae, runninge out of Germany, &c. remember vwhat they haue bin, that haue sett forth the same in this realme, a sort of flyinge braines, and light heads, which vvere neuer constant in any one thinge, vvhich vvas well seene in the often alteringe of their communion-booke, and turninge their table one day vvest, and another day east, they gott them a tankerd, and one saith I drinke and am thankefull, the more ioi of thee, saith another, &c. You neuer agreed vvith the Figurynes of Germa- nie, or vvith your selues, your stubburnesse is of vaine glory, and vve all see by your owne confession, how little cause you haue to be stubburne, your learninge is in feoffers hold, the Queenes grace is mercifull, if you vvill returne. Latymer. You shall haue no hope in

me to returne. And thus ended that disputation.

74. And heere Iohn Fox is very angry with Doctor VVeston for this speech, and for reuenge therof, maketh this note in the margent: Blasphemous lyes of Doctor VVeston sittinge in the chaire of pestilence, and then presently he maketh the narration of him, which before we haue related about *Vrge hoc, vrge hoc*, and in the margent he hath this other *Notandum, vrge hoc quod VVeston, vrst his beere-pott in his hand*: which notwithstandinge is more modest, then yf yt had byn a wyne-pott. And I maruayle much why the wisdome of Fox should obiect this beer-pott so often & eagerly against Doctor VVeston, seeing his owne great chaire, which is yet kept for a relique of his holines in London by the sisters, hath two places made on both sides therof, the one for the Candlesticke, the other for the ale-pott and nutmegges, which Father Fox is said to haue loued well, and so do his wrytings also shew, & yet no Catholike man I thinke hath euer obiected the same vnto him before this, as he doth the beer-pott to Doctor VVeston. But these are trifles. Lett vs passe to more serious considerations.

The Conclusion, with some Considerations thereon. §. 5.

75. By the re-view then of these three dayes disputations, a coniecture may be made, how matters

matters did passe then, and how they stand at this day betwixt vs and Protestants in these articles of controuersie: Yow haue heard before the great vaunts that Doctor Ridley made in his disputations at Cambridge vnder K. Edward, how euidently forsooth and apparently the truth stood with him and his fellowes, & this vpon five principall grounds and head-springs as he calleth them; vvhich are the Maieste and verity of scriptures; the most certaine testimony of the ancient Fathers; the definition of a Sacrament; the abhominable heresie of Eutiches, and the most sure beleefe of the article of our faith; He ascended vp to heauen.

Fox pag.
1161.

The vaunts
of Ridley
& Cranmer
haue vvell
performed.

Fox pag.
1261.

B. Cranmer also after that againe in the beginning of Q. Maryes raigne, settinge forth a certayne vauntinge schedell, which Fox called a Purgation of Thomas Archbishopp Cranmer, hath this challenge therin: I wish Peter Martyr (saith he) and other foure or five vvhich I shall choose, vvhich by Gods grace take vpon vs to defend all the doctrine and Religion, sett forth by our soueraigne Lord K. Edward the sixth to be more pure, and accordinge to Gods word, then any other that hath bin vsed in England these thousand yeares, so that Gods vverd may be iudge, and that the reasons and proofes of both parts may be sett out in vvytyng, to the entent as well, that all the world may examine and iudge thereon, as that no man shall start backe from his vvytyng.

76. Thus he. And now yow haue seene more or lesse by the former disputation, how he, & his fellow Ridley were able to performe their bragges, and though yow haue seene them brought to the exigents, which before hath

hath appeared: yet yf yow will beleue them
 or Iohn Fox their Chronicler, setting forth
 their Acts and Monuments, they were so farre
 off from being conquered, as the aduerse part
 was rather putt to the foyle, for that they
 could say nothinge in effect against them. And
 for example, Fox wryteth of Doctor Vveston
 (who most of all other vrged them with ma-
 ny good arguments as yow haue heard) that Fox pag.
1326.
 not only he had his Theſew there by him to help him out
 (to witt his beere-port) but moreouer that he said Ibid. pag.
1330.
 neuer a true word, nor made neuer a true conclusion al-
 most in that disputation. Which how true or false
 yt is, the reader himseife may be iudge, that
 hath perused ouer the same in this our re- view:
 And the very like in effect wryteth B. Cranmer Fox pag.
1331.
 in a certayne letter of his to the Councell,
 vpon the 23. of Aprill 1554. immediatly after
 the disputation ended, complayninge greatly
 of the disorder & iniquity therein vsed, which
 yet by that we haue examined before out of
 their owne words, I meane set downe in Fox,
 his penne being bent wholly to their fauour,
 there could not be great iniquity or inequali-
 ty, the combatt consistinge in discussinge au-
 thorities of auncient Fathers; but yt is the na-
 ture of this people as alwayes to be conten-
 tious, so euer to be clamourous, and neuer sa-
 tisfied except they haue their will, but espe-
 cially to wryte and speake both contemptu-
 ously and partially: yow shall heare how Mas-
 ter Ridley relateth the euent of this disputa-
 tion; for that hauinge sett downe his owne
 Y disput-

disputations and aunswers in the prison, and this with the greatest aduantage, yow must imagine that he could diuise, after much gall vttered in the preface therof against this disputation, concludeth the same with these passionate words, as they are in Fox.

D. Ridley's
passionate
speech of
the dispu-
tation.

Fox pag.
2330.

77. Thus vvas ended the most glorious disputation of the most holy Fathers, Sacrificers, Doctors and Maisters, vvho fought most manfully for their God and Gods, for their faith and felicity, for their countrey and kitchen, for their beuty and belly, vvith triumphant applauses and famous of the vvhole vniuersity. So hee. And by this yow may know the man, and how much his words are to be credited; yow hauing considered what hath byn laid downe before, by Fox his owne report, touching the substance of the disputation and authorities of Fathers, alleaged and examined and shifted of, though in the forme of scholasticall disputation and vrging arguments, yt may be there were some disorders; yet that maketh not so much to the purpose, how arguments were vrged against them, as how they were aunswered by them; and yet could not the disorder be so great, as it was vnder Ridley himselfe in the Cambridge-disputation, as is most euident to the reader by Fox his owne relation, who as before I haue noted, is alwayes to be presumed to relate the worst for vs, and the best for himselfe in all these actions.

78. Wherefore yt is not a little to be considered, what was the difference in substance or substantiall proofes, brought forth in the Cambridge

bridge Protestant-disputations vnder K. Edward, and these Oxford Catholike-disputations vnder Q. Mary; and whether Doctor Ridley that was moderator of those, or Doctor VVeston prolocutor in these, did best vrge or solue arguments against their aduersaryes; for that this consideration and comparison only, will giue a great light to discern also the difference of the causes therein defended. One thing also more is greatly in my opinion to be weighed in this matter, which is, that the said auncient Fathers hauinge to persuaide so high and hard a mystery as this is; that Christs true and naturall flesh and bloud, are really vnder the formes of bread and wyne, by vertue of the Priests consecration, they were forced to vse all the manner of most significant speeches, which they could diuise to expresse the same, and to beate yt into the peoples heads and mynds, though contrary to their senses and common reason, and therby to fly from the opposite heresie and infidelity of our Sacramentaryes; lurking naturally in the harts of flesh and bloud, and of sensuall people; but synce that tyme by Sathans incytation, broached and brought forth publikely into the world. For meetinge wherwith the holy prouidence of almighty God was, that the forsaide Fathers should by all sorts of most significant speeches & phrases, as hath byn said, so cleerly lay open their meanings in this matter, as no reasonable man can doubt therof, and not only this; but also that they should vse certaine

exaggerations the better to explaine themselves, such as they are wont to do in other controuerfies also, when they would vehemently oppose themselves against any error or heresie, as by the examples of *Saint Augustine* against the *Pelagians* in behalfe of *Grace*, and against the *Manichees* in the defence of *Free-will*. And of *S. Hierome* against *Iouinian* for the priuiledge of *Virginity* *aboue marriage*. and other like questions, wherein the said Fathers, to make themselves the better vnderstood, do vse sometymes such exaggeratiue speeches, as they may seeme to inclyne somewhat to the other extreme, which indeed they do not, but do shew therby their feruour in defence of the truth, and hatred of the heresie which they impugne.

The Fathers effectually speeches to persuade the reall-presence.

Chrysost.
hom. 61. ad
Pop. Antioch. &
alii.

79. And the like may be obserued in this article of the reall-presence, of Christs sacred body in the Sacrament of the Altar, which being a mystery of most high importance, and hardest to be beleeued, as aboue humayne sense and reason, and therefore called by them: *the myracle of mysterjes*: yt was necessary for them, I say, to vse as many effectually wayes, as they possible could for perswadinge the said truth vnto the people, and for preuenting the distrustfull cogitations and suggestions both of humayne infirmity, and diabolicall infidelity against the receaued faith and truth of this article; and so they did, not only vsinge most cleere, plaine, effectually and significant manner of expounding themselves, and their meaning,

ninge, but many such exaggerations also, as must needs make vs see the desire they had, to be rightly and fully vnderstood therein. For better consideration of which point (being of singular moment as hath byn said) the reader shall haue a little patience, whilst I detayne my selfe somewhat longer, then I meane to haue done, in layinge forth the same before him.

80. And first of all, concerninge the effectuall speeches for vttering the truth of their beleefe in this article, yow haue heard much in the former disputation, and heere we shall repeat some points againe, which in effect are, that wheras the said Fathers founded themselves ordinarily vpon those speeches of our Sauour: *This is my body vvhich shalbe giuen for you: my flesh is truly meate, and my bloud is truly drinke. The bread vvhich I shall giue you is my flesh for the life of the worlde*, and other like sentences of our Sauour; the Fathers do not only vrge all the circumstances heere specified or signified, to proue yt to be the true naturall and substantiall body of Christ (as that yt was to be giuen for vs the next day, after Christs words were spoken, that yt was to be giuen for the life of the whole world, & that yt was truly meate, and truly Christs flesh) but do adde also diuers other circumstances of much efficacy to confirme the same, affirminge the same more in particular; *that it is the very same body which was borne of the blessed Virgin, the very same body that suffered on the Crosse, corpus*

Matth. 26.

Luc. 14.

Iohn. 6.

Chrysost.
hom. 14. in
1. Cor.

affixum, verberatum, crucifixum, cruentatum, lancea vulneratum (saith S. Chrysostome) the selfe-same body, that was nayled, beaten, crucified, blouded, wounded with a speare, is receaued by vs in the Sacrament. Whervnto S. Austen addeth this particularity, that yt is the selfe-same body that walked heere amonge vs vpon earth.

Aug. in
Psalm. 98.

As he vwalked heere in flesh (saith he) amonge vs; so the very selfe same flesh doth he giue to be eaten, and therefore no man eateth, that flesh; but first adoreth it;

Hesich. in
cap. 11.
Lectis.

and Hesichius addeth; that he gaue the selfe-same body, vvhich of the Angell Gabriell said to the Virgin Mary, that it should be conceaued of the holy Ghost.

Chrysost.
hom. 2. in
2. ad Cor.

And yet further; yt is the same body (saith S. Chrysostome) that the Magi, or learned men did adore in the manger. But thou dost see him (saith he) not in the manger, but in the Altar, not in the armes of a woman, but in the hands of a Priest.

Aug. in
Psalm. 33.
concion. 1.
et 2.

The very same flesh (saith S. Austen againe) that sate at the table in the last supper, and vvasht his disciples feet; The very same (I say) did Christ giue with his owne hands to his disciples, vvhich he said; take eate, this is my body, &c.

And so did he beare himselfe in his owne hands, vvhich vvas prophesied of Dauid, but fulfilled only by Christ in that Supper.

Cyrril. Hie-
ros. Cathec.
4. mystagog.

81. These are the particularities vsed by the Fathers for declaring what body they meane; and can there be any more effectuell speeches then these? but yet harken further. Thou must know and hold for most certaine (saith S. Cyrril) that this vvhich seemeth to be bread, is not bread but Christs body, though the tast doth iudge it bread. And againe the same Father: Vnder the forme or shew of bread,

is giuen

is giuen to thee the body of Christ, & vnder the forme or shape of wine, is giuen to thee the bloud of Christ, &c.

And S. Chrysostome to the same effect: VVe must Chrysost. hom. 60. ad Pop. Antioch.

not beleue our senses easie to be beguiled, &c. VVe must simply, and without all ambyguity beleue the

vvords of Christ sayinge: This is my body, &c. O how

many say now adayes, I vvould see him, I vvould behould

his visage, his vestments, &c. But he doth more then

this, for he giueth himselfe not only to be seene, but to be

touched also, handled and eaten by thee. Nor only do

the Fathers affirme so asseuerantly, that yt is

the true naturall body of Christ, though yt

appeare bread in forme and shape, and that we

must not beleue our senses heerin; but do de-

ny expressely that yt is bread after the words

of consecration, wherof yow heard longe dis-

courses before out of S. Ambrose in his books

de sacramentis, and de iniciandis. Before the words of

consecration, it is bread (saith he) but after consecra-

tion, *de pane fit caro Christi*, of bread yt is made the

flesh of Christ; And note the word (*fit*) yt is

made. And againe. Before the words of Christ be

uttered (in the consecration) the chalice is full of

vvine and vvater; but vvhen the vvords of Christ haue

vvrought their effect, *ibi sanguis efficitur qui red-*

emit plebem, there is made the bloud that redeemed

the people. And marke in like manner the word

efficitur, is made, and consider whether any

thinge can be spoken more plainly.

83. But yet the Fathers cease not heere, but

do passe much further to inculcate the truth

of this matter, reprehending sharply all doubt,

suspicion or ambyguity, which the weaknesse

Chrysost. hom. 60. ad Pop. Antioch.

Amb. l. 4. de Sacram. cap. 4. & l. de iniciand.

All doubt about this matter condemned.

*Cyrril Hier.
catech. my-
flagog. 4*

of our flesh or infection of heresie may suggest in this matter. S. Cyrril reasoneth thus: *VVheras* Christ hath said of the bread, *this is my body*, vvho vvill dare to doubt thereof? and vvheras he hath said of the wine, *this is my blood*, vvho vvill doubt or say yt is not his blood? he once turned vvater into vvine in Cana of Galiley by his only will. which wine is like vnto blood, and shall vve not thinke him vvorthy to be beleeued, vvhen he saith, that he hath changed vvine into his blood? So he. And S. Ambrose to the same effect.

*Ambro. l. 4.
de Sacardot.
cap. 4.*

Our Lord Iesvs Christ doth testifie vnto vs, that we do receaue his body and blood, and may we doubt of his credit or testimony? And the other Saint Cyrril of Alexandria saith to the same effect, that in this

*Cyrril. Alex.
l. 4 inc. 13.
Joan.*

mystery we should not so much as aske *quomodo* how yt can be done? *Iudaicum enim verbum est* (saith he) & *eterni supplicij causa*: For yt is a Iewish word, and caule of euerlastinge torment. And before them both Saint Hilary left wrytten this exhortation: These things (saith he) that are wrytten, lett vs read, and those things that vve reade lett vs vnderstand, and so vve shall perfectly performe the duty of true faith; for that these points vvich vve affirme of the naturall verity of Christs being in vs, except we learne them of Christ himselfe, we affirme them wickedly and foolubly, &c. *VVherfore*, vvheras he saith my flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drinke, there is no place left to vs of doubting concerning the truth of Christs body & blood, for that both by the affirmation of Christ himselfe, and by our owne beleefe, there is (in the Sacrament) the flesh truly and the blood truly of our Saviour.

*Hilar. l. 8.
de trinit.
cont. Ar-
rian.*

83. So great S. Hilary: and Eusebius Emiffenus bringeth

bringeth in Christ our Sauour speakinge in these words: For so much as my flesh is truly meat, Euseb. Emisissus. hom 5. de fide. and my blood is truly drinke, leit all doubtfullnes of infidelity depart; for so much as he vvhho is the author of the gift, is vvitnesse also of the truth therof. And S. Leo to the same effect: No hinge at all is to be doubted of the truth of Christs body, and blood in the Sacrament, &c. And those do in vaine answer amen (when they receaue yt) if they dispute against that which is affirmed. And finally S. Epiphanius concludeth thus: He that beleeueth it not to be the very body of Christ in the Sacrament, is fallen from grace and saluation. Leo serm. 6. de scurrilo 7. rousf. Epiph. in Anaw.

84. And by this we may see the earnestnesse of the Fathers in vrginge the beleefe of Christs true flesh, and blood in the Sacrament; But they cease not heere, but do preuent and exclude all shifts of Sacramentaries, which by Gods holy spiritt they forswaw, euen in those auncient dayes, affirminge that not by faith only, or in figure, or image, or spiritually alone Christs flesh is to be eaten by vs; but really, substantially, and corporally: Not only by faith (saith S. Chrysostome) but in very deed he maketh vs his body, reducinge vs as yt were into one masse or substance vvith himselfe. And Saint Cyrill: Not only by faith and charity are we spiritually conioyned to Christ (by his flesh in the Sacrament) but corporally also by communication of the same flesh. And S. Chrysostome againe: Not only by loue, but in very deed are we conuerted into his flesh by eatinge the same. And Saint Cyrill againe: VVhether receauinge (in the Sacrament corporally and substantially the sonne of God vnited naturally. Chrysost. in hom. 87. in cap. 21. Matth. Cyril. Alex. l. 10. in cap. 17. Iouan. Chrysost. ib. Cyril. Alex. ib. l. 11. in Iouan. c. 27.

turally to his Father, we are clarified & glorified thereby, and made partakers of his supreme nature. Thus they. Whervnto for more explication addeth Theophilact: VVhen Christ said: This is my body; he shewed that it vvas his very body in deed, and not any figure correspondent therunto, for he said not; this is the figure of my body; but, this is my body; by vvhich vvords the bread is transformed by an vnspeakable operation, though to vs it seeme still bread. And againe in another place. Behould that the bread vvhich is eaten by vs in the mysteryes, is not only a figuration of Christs flesh, but the very flesh indeed, for Christ said not, that the bread vvhich I shall giue you, is the figure of my flesh, but my very flesh indeed, for that the bread is transformed by * secrett vvords into the flesh. And another Father more auncient then he, aboue twelue hundred yeares past, handlinge those words of Christ This is my body, saith: It is not the figure of Christs body and bloud; vt quidam stupida mente nugati sunt; as some blockish mynds haue trifled; but it is truly the very body and bloud of our Satiour indeed. And finally the whole generall Councell of Nice the second, aboue 800. yeares past, hath these words: do you read, as longe as you vvill, you shall neuer find Christ or his Apostles, or the Faibers to haue called the vnbloudy sacrifice of Christ offered by the Priest, an image (or representation) but the very body and bloud of Christ it selfe. And could the auncient Fathers speake more effectually, properly or cleerly then this?

85. And yet he that will examine and weigh their sayings, a man exactly shall find them to speake, in a certaine manner more effectually:

for

Theophil.
Alex. in
cap. 10.
Marc.

Idem in ca.
6. Iean.

* arcanis
verbu.

Magnet. 1. 3.
ad Theost.
nem.

Conc. Ni-
cen. 2. an. 6

for that they did study, (as we haue said) how to vtter their meaninge with emphasie. *S. Hilary* vseth this kind of argument: *ys the word of God were truly made flesh, then dowe truly receaue his flesh in the Lords supper, and therby he is to be esteemed to dwell in vs naturally:* *S. Cyrill* proueth, not only a spirituall, but a naturall and bodily vnion to be betwene vs and Christ, by eatinge his flesh in the Sacrament. *Theodore* doth proue that Christ tooke flesh of the blessed Virgin, and ascended vp with the same, and holdeth the same there, by that he giueth to vs his true flesh in the Sacrament; for that otherwayes he could not giue vs his true flesh to eate, yf his owne flesh were not true, seeing that he gaue the same that he carryed vp, and retayneth in heauen. *S. Irenaeus, S. Iustine, & S. Chrysostome* do proue not only this, but the resurrection also of our bodies by the truth of Christs flesh in the Sacrament, for that our flesh ioyninge with his flesh which is immortall, ours shalbe immortall also. And the same *Saint Irenaeus* also doth proue further, that the great God of the ould Testament, creator of heauen and earth, was Christs Father; for prooffe wherof he alleagerh this reason; that Christ in the Sacrament did fullfill the figures of the old Testament, & that in particular, wherein bread was a figure of his flesh, which he fulfilled (*saith Irenaeus*) makinge yt his flesh indeed.

86. I passe ouer many other formes of speaches no lesse effectuell; which doe easily declare the Fathers mynds and meaninges in this

Emphaticall & effectuell speaches of the fathers.

Hilar. lib. 8. de Trinit. Cyrl. l. 11. in Ioan. 2. 26

Theod. dial. 2. unconfus.

Iren. lib. 4. cont. haer. cap. 3. Iustm apol. 2. ad Antonin Pium Imp. Chrysost. hom 60. & 61. ad pop. Antioch.

*Optat. l. 6.
contra Do-
natist.*

*Chalice-
breakers.*

*Leo serm.
7. de l'as-
chate.*

this point, as that of *Optatus Mileuitanus*, who accused the Donatists of sacriledge & horrible wickednesse, for hauinge broken downe Catholike Altars, wheron the body, and bloud of Christ had byn borne: *VWhat is so sacrilegiou* (saith he) *as to breake downe, scrape and remoue the Altars of God, on vvhich your selues haue sometymes offered, and the members of Christ haue byn borne, &c.* *VWhat is an Altar*, but the seate of the body and blond of Christ? and this monstrous villany of yours is doubled, for that yow haue broken also the chalices, vvhich did beare the bloud of Christ himselfe. So he. And is there any Protestant, that will speake thus at this day? or doth not this reprehension agree fully to Protestants, that haue broken downe more Altars, and chalices, then euer the Donatists did? *Saint Leo* the first saith: that the truth of Christs true body and bloud in the Sacrament, was so notorious in his dayes; *vt nec ab infantium lingua taceretur*. That very infants did professe the same. And in the same sermon he saith: that the body of Christ is so receaued by vs in the Sacrament; *vt in carnem ipsius, qui caro nostra factus est, transeamus*, that we should passe into his flesh, who by his incarnation is made our flesh. *Saint Chrysostome* in many places of his works, doth vse such deuout, reuerent and significant speeches of that, which is conteyned in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread, & wyne after consecration, as no doubt can be of his meaninge, whereof yow haue heard diuers points before in the disputations, as that it deserued the highest honour in earth; that he

did

did shew it lying vpon the Altar, that the Angels descended at the tyme of consecration, and did adore Christ there present with trembling and feare, and durst not looke vpon him for the Maiestie of his presence. And other such speeches, which is conforme to that before cyted in the disputation out of the Councell of Nice: *Credamus iacere in illa mensa sacra, agnum Dei à Sacerdotibus sacrificatum.* Let vs beleue to lye on that holy table, the lambe of God sacrificed by Priests. And is there any Protestant that will speake thus?

87. But aboue all the rest are those speeches, which before I said to tend to a certeyne exaggeration, as that, *our flesh is turned into his flesh by receauinge the blessed Sacrament: that our flesh is nourished by his; and that of two fleshes there is made but one flesh;* Whervnto do appertayne not onely those former phrases; which already yow haue heard of the naturall and corporall vinity; which the Fathers do so often inculcate, to be betweene Christ and vs, by eatinge his flesh in the Sacrament, & that we are brought therby into one masse, or substance of flesh with him; but many other like significant manners for utteringe their myndes, as that of S. Chrysostome: *he nourisheth vs with his owne body, and doth ioyne and conglutinate our flesh to his.* And againe: That by his body (giuen vs in the Sacrament) *Se nobis commiscuit, & in vnum nobiscum rededit.* He hath mixt himselfe to vs, and brought himselfe and vs into one body and flesh. And yet further: he doth permitt himselfe not only to be handled by vs, but also to be

Chrysost.
hom. 61. ad
Pop. Antioch. &
hom. 6. de
verbu
Isaia &
hom. 3. de
incompra-
hensi. Dei
natura.

Exaggera-
tiue spea-
ches of
the Fa-
thers to
utter their
minds the
more
clearly.

Chrysost.
hom. 61. ad
Pop. Antioch. &
hom. 45. in
Ioan.

Cyrril.
Alex lib. 4.
in Ioan. cap.
27.

1. Cor. 5.

Idein. l. 10.
in Ioan. cap.
23.

Marcus
Anachoreta
in 1. ad Cor.

Iren. lib. 4.
cont. heres.
cap. 34.

Ibid. lib. 5.
cap. 2.

be eaten, and our teeth to be fastened vpon his flesh, and vs to be filled with the same flesh; which is the greatest point of loue (saith *Saint Chrysostome*) that possible can be imagined. So he. And conforme to this *S. Cyrill of Alexandria* vttereth himselfe after another sort, for he vseth the example of leuen, which *Saint Paul* doth touch in his epistle to the Corinthians, when he saith; that a little leuen doth leuen a whole batch; euen so (saith *S. Cyrill*) the flesh of Christ ioyned to our flesh, doth leuen or pearse through it, and conuert it into it selfe. And in another place he vseth this similitude; that as vwhen you take a peece of vvax melted at the fire, and do droppe the same vpon another peece of vvax, these two vvaxes are made one; so by the communication of Christs body and bloud vnto vs, he is in vs and we in him.

88. Another auncient Father also vpon the point of 1200. yeares gone had this similitude:

As wine (saith he) is mixed vvith him that drinketh the same, in such sort, as the wine is in him, and he in the wine: so is the bloud of Christ mixed also vvith him that drinketh the same in the Sacrament. And *S. Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, & *S. Iustinus Martyr*, all of them elder then this man, do vse commonly this phrase of nourishinge, and feedinge our flesh by the flesh of Christ. How do they affirme (saith *S. Irenaeus* against certayne heretiks that denied the resurrection) that our flesh shall come to corruption, and not receaue life againe, vvhich is nourished by the body and bloud of Christ? And againe. *Ex quibus augetur & consistit carnis nostra substantia*. Of which body and bloud of Christ, the substance

stance of our flesh is encreased and consisteth. And *Tertullian*, *caro, corpore & sanguine Christi* *rescitur, &c.* Our flesh doth feed on the body and blood of Christ. And marke that he saith the flesh, and not only the soule. And *Iustine* in his second Apology to the Emperour *Antoninus* talkinge of the Sacrament, saith, it is, *cibum quo sanguis carnesq; nostra aluntur*. The meat wherwith our blood and flesh is fedd; and to this manner of speech appertayne those sayings of *S. Chrysostome*: *Altare meum cruentum sanguine*, my Altar that is made redd with blood. Where he speaketh in the person of Christ. And againe to him that had receaued the Sacrament, *dignus es habitum qui eum carnes lingua tangeres*: Thou are made worthy to touch with thy tongue the flesh of Christ: And yet further in another place: *Thou seest Christ sacrificed in the Altar, the Priest attendinge to his sacrifice, and pouring out prayers; the multitude of people receauinge the Sacrament, pretioso illo sanguine intingi & rubesceri*. To be died and made read with that pretious blood. All which speeches and many more, that for breuity I pretermitt, though they tend to a certayne exaggeration (as hath byn said) yet do they plainly declare the sense, iudgement and beleefe of the Fathers in this article, and so albeit literally, and in rigour, they be not in all respects verified: yet need we no better arguments to certifie vs of the Fathers meaninges then these, to witt, how farre they were of, from the Protestants opinions in this mystery.

Tert. lib. de resurrectione carnis.

Chrysost. hom. 24. in 1. Cor. 10.

Hom. 27. in c. 11. ad Cor.

Ibid. l. 3. de Sacerdot.

89. And truly yf we would now put downe heere on the contrary side the Protestants assertions, and their cold manner of speeches in this behalfe, and compare them with this vehemency of the Fathers; we should presently see a wonderfull difference. I will touch some few only conteyned in this booke. First they

1.

say (and yt is a common refuge of *Cranmer* and the rest in this disputation as you haue heard) that their communion-bread is Christs true body, as *S. Iohn Baptist* was true *Elias*.

2.

Item. That yt is Christs body, as the doue was the holy-ghost.

3.

Item. That the body of Christ is eaten in the Sacrament of the Altar, no otherwise then yt is in baptisme.

4.

Item. That infants when they be baptized do eate the body of Christ also.

5.

Item. That Christs body is in the Sacrament, as when two or three are gathered together in his name.

6.

Item. That the body of Christ is eaten in the Sacrament, as yt is eaten, when wee read scriptures, or heare sermons.

7.

Item. That the breakinge of Christs body is nothinge but the breaking of the scriptures to the people. And these are the common phrases of all lightly. For I lett passe many particular assertions of some, much more cold and contemptible then these, wherby yow may easily see the difference of estimation, reuerence, respect, and beleefe betweene them and the auncient Fathers.

go. And on the other side, he that will consider the great care and warynesse, which the said Fathers did vse in speakinge properly and exactly, as well in other mysteryes & articles of our faith, as in this, shall easily see, that they could not fall into such excesse of speech, with open reprehension & contradiction of others, yf their meaninge had not byn euident, and the doctrine Catholike and generally receaued, which they endeauoured to inculcate by these speeches, for so much as we are taught by all antiquity, that there was such exact rigour vsed in this behalfe in those dayes, that a word or sillable could not be spoken amisse, without present note or checke. And *S. Hierome* saith: that sometymes for one only vvord heretiks haue byn cast out of the Church. And *Saint Basil* being intreated and vrged by a Gouvernour of *Constantius* the *Arrian* Emperour, to accomodate himselfe in manner of speech only about two words: *homiousion*, and *homousion* (which are not, said the gouernour, found in scripture) he answered him noe: & that for one Sillable he vvould offer his life, yf it vvere need. And the like exactnesse did the anciēt Fathers, of the Coucell of *Ephesus*, shew afterwards in standinge so resolutely for the word *Deipara*, mother of God against *Nestorius*, & refusing the vse of the other word *Christipara*, mother of Christ, though the one & the other of the words refused, to witt, *homiousion* & *Christipara* in their senses are true; but for that some hereticall meaninge might lurke therin, they were refused.

The great warynesse of the Fathers in speakinge of articles of faith.

*Hier. lib. 3.
Apol. cont.
Ruffin,*

*Theodoret.
lib. 2. hist.
c. 18. & 19.*

*Coucil.
Ephes. act.
1. & 2.*

91. And to conclude, yf antiquity was so carefull and vigilant, to exclude dangerous & incommodious speeches in other articles, how much more would yt haue byn in this also of the *reall presence*, yf the said Fathers speeches before rehearsed had not byn true, as in the Protestants sense they cannot be, but must needs tend to most dangerous error of misbeleefe and idolatry? And consequently there is no doubt, but that they would haue byn reprobued by other Fathers, yf the Protestants opinions had byn then receaued for truth. And this shall suffice for this Chapter.

OF THE TWO OTHER ARTICLES ABOUT

*Transubstantiation, and the Sacrament, what passed in this
Disputation.*

C H A P. V I.

HA V I N G E handled more largely, then was purposed at the beginninge, so much as apperteyneth to the first article of the *reall presence*, as the ground and foundation of the other two; I meane to be very breefe concerninge the rest, as well for that in the *Oxford-disputations* there was scarce any thinge handled therof;

therof; but only some demonstrations out of the Fathers alleaged to *Latimer* (which he as yow haue heard could not aunswere) about the third and last point; as also for that whatsoever was treated therof in the disputations at *Cambridge*, and in the *Conuocation-house*, especially about *Transubstantiation*, hath byn answered for the most part in our former treatise about the reall presence. And albeit it was some art of the Sacramentaryes, in the beginninge of these controuersies vnder *K. Edward*, to runne from the discussion of the principall point, as more cleerly against them, vnto the question of *Transubstantiation*, for that might seeme to yeld them some more shew of matter or obiections to cauill at, as before we haue declared: yet when the matter commeth to examination, they haue as little for them in this as in the other, or rather lesse, for that the other, to witt, the *reall-presence*, or being of Christ really and substantially present in the Sacrament, hauinge byn so evidently proued against them, as before yow haue seene; this other of *Transubstantiation*, being but *modus essendi*, the manner how Christ is there, little importeth them; nay themselues do graunt, that yf Christ be there really present, yt cannot be denied but that he is there also by *Transubstantiation* of bread into his body: for so *Father Latimer*, yf yow remember, affirmed before in his disputations, when he was said once to haue byn a Lutheran (which Lutherans do hould both Christs body and bread to be together

Reall presence cannot be graunted without *Transubstantiation* according to *Latimer*.

Fox pag.
1124.

in the Sacrament) he answered, I say, that he could neuer perceaue, how *Luther* could defend his opinion without *Transubstantiation*, & that the *Tygurynes*, being also Sacramentaries, did write a booke against him in this behalfe, prouinge belike that in grauntinge the reall presence, as he did; he must needs graunt *Transubstantiation* also, wherein they had great reason: for that in truth the imagination of *Luther*, and *Lutherans*, that Christs body and bread doe stand togeather, vnder the same formes and accidents, and be receaued togeather being so different substances, is a most grosse and fond imagination; so as the *Lutherans* graunting the one, & denying the other, are condemned of absurdity euen by the *Zuinglians* themselves, as yow see, and as we say also iustly.

2. And on the other side we say in like manner, as before hath byn noted, that the *Zuinglians* and *Caluinists*, and other Sacramentaries denyinge wholly the said reall presence, do in vayne wrangle about *Transubstantiation*. For as he that should deny (for example sake) that any substance of gould were in a purse, or any substance of wyne in a barrell, should in vaine dispute whether the gold were there alone, or togeather with some baser metall, as siluer, tynne, or copper, or whether the wyne were there alone, or in company of water; so in this controuersie yt is an idle disputation for Sacramentaries to discusse, whether the substance of Christs reall flesh be alone in the Sacrament,

erament, or together with the substance of bread, for so much as they deny yt to be there at all.

3. Yet notwithstanding, for that their cheefe altercation is about this point, as by their disputations may appeare, I shall breiefely examine their grounds, vvhich, accordinge to

Ridleyes
fiue
grounds
against
Transubstan-
tiation at
Cambridge.
anno 1549.
Fox pag.
1261.

B. Ridleyes ostentation vttered in Cambridge out of the diuinity chayre, vnder King Edward the sixt, as before yow haue heard, are fiue in number sett forth in these vauntinge words: The principall grounds or rather head-springs of this matter are specially fiue. First, the authority, maiestie, & verity of holy scriptures: the second: the most certayne testimonyes of the auncient Catholike Fathers: the third, The definition of a Sacrament: the fourth, The abhominable heresie of Eutiches, that may ensue of Transubstantiation. The fifth: the most sure beleefe of the article of our faith: He ascended into heauen. And then a little after he concludeth thus: These be the reasons vvhich persuaide me to inclyne to this sentence and iudgement.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

For ibid.

4. Heere yow see the principall grounds, or rather head springs, that persuaied Ridley to inclyne, or rather declyne, for yet he seemed not fully settled in this article of beleefe. And albeit these grounds may seeme to conteyne somewhat, in shew and sound of words: yet when the substance thereof commeth to be examined, they are found to be idle, and puffed vp with words indeed. For first what authority, maiesty and verity of scriptures doth this man bring forth; trow you, for confirma-

The first
ground
examined.

Math. 26.

Mark. 14.

* 1. Cor. II.

Exod. 7.

Joan. 6.

tion of this his vaunt? truly nothing in effect, or of any shew or probability, but only that yt is called bread and wyne in the scripture, after the words of consecration: For which purpose he hauinge alleaged the words of Christ: *I will not drinke heerafter of this fruite of the vyne, vntill I do drinke yt new vvith yow in the kingdome of my Father*: he inferreth that the fruite of the vyne is wyne, which we graunt vnto him, & do hould is called wyne by him after the consecration, as his flesh after the words of consecration is called bread by S. * Paul, S. Luke, and other Apostles, affirming yt notwithstanding to be his owne true body and flesh, but retayning the name of bread, for that yt was made of bread, and was bread before, as the serpent was called the rodd of Aaron, for that yt was made of that rodd, and not because yt was not a true serpent afterwards, though yt were still called a rodd, and to signifie this, that bread conuerted into Christs flesh is not really bread afterward, but the true flesh of Christ, though yt retayne the former name of bread, yt is not simply called bread but with some addition; as *bread of life: bread of heauen, this bread,* and the like. And finally Christ himselfe doth expound what bread yt is in S. Iohns ghospell when he saith: *The bread that I shall giue yow, is my flesh for the life of the vvorld.*

5. Heere then yow see, that Ridleyes text of scripture; *I vvill not drinke heerafter of the fruite of the vyne, vntill I drinke yt new vvith yow in the Kingdome of my Father*; doth not proue that yt

was

was materiall wine which he dronke, for that he should then drinke materiall wyne also in heauen: And yet assoone as *Ridley* had brought forth this place, as though he had done a great feate, and fully performed his promise, for prooffe of the authority, maiesty, and verity of scripture, he beginneth presently to excuse himselfe, for that he hath no more store, sayinge. *There be not many places of scripture, that do confirme this thinge; neyther is yt greatly materiall, for yt is inough yf there be any one plaine testimony for the same.* Lo whervnto this vaunt of the authority, maiesty, and verity of holy scriptures is come, to witt, to one place, vnderstood and interpreted after his owne meaninge alone, against the vnderstandinge of all antiquity. And though he go about afterwards to scrape togeather diuers other parings of scripture, nothinge at all to the purpose, as, *Yow shall not breake any bone of his: Do yow this in my remembrance: labour for the meate that perisheth not: this is the worke of God, that they beleue in him whome he hath sent: he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud, dwelleth in me and I in him;* and some other like places: yet as yow see by his owne confession, they are not plaine places, and consequently his vauntinge of authority, maiesty and verity of scriptures, commeth to iust nothinge indeed, but only to words and wynde. Lett vs see what he bringeth for his other foure grounds and headsprings.

6. The second is, *the most certayne testimonyes of the auncient Catholike Fathers.* This we shall examine

Fox pag. 1261.

Impertinent places alleaged against Transubstantiation.

*Exod 12.
1. Cor 11.
Iacobi 6.*

Ridley's second ground of fathers.

mine afterwards when we haue considered of the other three, yet may yow marke by the way, that he vseth heere also the superlatiue degree, *as most certayne testimonyes*, which certainty of testimonyes yow shall find afterward, to be like his *maiesty of scriptures*, already alleaged. Wherefore let vs see his third ground.

Ridleyes 3.
ground.
The nature of a
Sacramēt.

The third ground (saith he) is the nature of the Sacrament, which consisteth in three things: *unity, nutrition and conuersion*. And then he explaneth himselfe thus: *that as in bread one loafe is made of many graynes, so signifieth this Sacrament, that we are all one mysticall body in Christ. And againe. As bread nourisheth our body; so doth the body of Christ nourish our soule. And thirdly. As bread is turned into our substance, so are vve turned into Christs substance. All vvhich three effects cannot be signified (saith he) by this Sacrament, yf there be Transubstantiation, and no nature of bread left, and therefore there can be no Transubstantiation.*

Sup. cap. 3.
§. 8.

7. This is Maister Ridleyes deepe diuinity about the nature of this Sacrament: but yf yow reade that which we haue noted before in our eyght obseruation, concerninge the true definition and nature of a Sacrament in deed; yow will see that this was great simplicity in him (though accordinge to his hereticall ground, that the Sacramēts doe not giue grace) to leaue out the principall effect signified in the Sacrament, which is grace, for that a Sacrament is defined: *A visible signe of inuisible grace receaued therby*. This Sacrament also is a signe of Christs body there present vnder the formes;

formes of bread and wyne: yet deny we not but that these other three effects also of vni-ty, nutrition and conuersion may be signified therby, as in like manner the death and passion of our Sauour, wherof this Sacrament is a memoriall and commemoration: neyther doth the *Transubstantiation* of the bread into the body of Christ, lett or take away these significations, for so much as to make this Sacrament, there is taken bread and wyne, which naturally doth signifie these effects of vnion, nutrition, and conuersion, which *Ridley* heere mentioneth, though yt be not necessary, that the substance of the said bread and wyne should still remayne, but only there formes and accidents, which do signifie and are signes to our senses, as much as yf the substances themselues of bread and wyne were present.

As for example the brasen serpent, did as much represent, and was a signe of Christ in respect of the analogie betwene Christ and a true serpent, as yf he had had the substance of a true serpent, whereof he had but only the forme and shape; and so are the outward formes of bread and wyne, after the words of consecration, sufficient to represent vnto vs the Analogy that is betweene feedinge the body, and feedinge the soule, vnity of graines, and vnity of Christs mysticall body which is his Church.

8. And thus much of *Ridleyes* third ground which impugneeth *Transubstantiation*; which ground (as yow see) is so weake and feeble, as he

Fox pag. 1261.

Exod. 7.

as he that shall build thereon, is like to come to a miserable ruine of his owne saluation.

*Ridley's 4.
ground a-
bout Eu-
tiches his
heresie.*

But much more ridiculous is his fourth ground, vttered in these words: *The fourth ground (saith he) is the abhominable heresie of Eutiches, that may ensue of Transubstantiation.* Thus he saith in his position, but lett vs heare him afterward in his probation, which is not much larger then his proposition, for thus he wryteth: *They which say that Christ is carnally present in the Eucharist, do take from him the verity of mans nature. Eutiches graunted the diuine nature in Christ, but his humayne nature he denyed.* And is not this a goodly prooffe of so great a charge? Nay is not this a goodly ground and headspringe of proofes? Consider I pray yow how these matters do hange togeather. *Eutiches heresy was, as yow may see in the letters of Saint Leo the first, and in the Councell of Calcedon;* that Christs flesh being ioyned to his diuinity was turned into the same, and so not two distinct natures remayned, but one only made of them both. And how doth this heresie I pray yow, follow of our doctrine of Transubstantiation? *Eutiches said that the diuine and humayne natures in Christ were confounded togeather, and of two made but one: we say that they remayne distinct, and do condemne Eutiches for his opinion, and by our Church he was first accursed and anathematized for the same: Eutiches said, Christs humayne nature was turned into his diuine; we say only that bread and wyne is turned into*

*Zoepp. 11.
ad Theodos.
Concil. Cal-
ced. sess. 5.*

Christe

Christs flesh and blood: what likenesse hath this with *Eutiches* heresie? But (saith *Ridley*) we do take from Christ the verity of mans nature. This is a fiction and foolish calumniation, as before yow haue heard, and consequently deserueth no further refutation.

9. The fifth ground, is (saith he) the most sure beleefe of the article of our faith: He ascended into heauen. This ground yf yow remember hath byn ouerthrowne before, and abandoned by *Ridley* himselfe in his Oxford-disputation, where he graunted; that he did not so straitly tie Christ vp in heauen (to vse his owne words) but that he may come downe on earth at his pleasure. And againe in another place of the said disputation: VVhat letteth but that Christ yf yt please him, and vvhhen yt pleaseth him, may be in heauen and in earth? &c. And yet further to *Doctor Smith* that asked him this question: Doth he so sitt at the right hand of his Father, that he doth neuer foresake the same? *Ridley* aunswered: Nay I do not bynd Christ in heauen so straitly. By which aunsweres yow see, that this whole principall ground and head-springe of *Ridleyes* arguments against *Transubstantiation*, is quite ouerthrowne. For yf Christ in flesh after his ascension may be also on earth when he will, as *Ridley* heere graunteth, then is it not against the article of our Creed (He ascended into heauen,) to beleefe, that notwithstandinge his ascension, he may be also on earth in the Sacrament. And albeit *Ridley* do cyte heere certayne places of *S. Augustine*, that do seeme to say: that Christ after his

Ridleyes 9.
ground
concerning
Christs
ascension.

For pag.
1314.
1515.

his ascension is no more conuerfant amonge vs vpon earth; yet that is not to be vnderstood of his being in the Sacrament, which is a spirituall manner of being, but of his corporall manner of conuersation, as he liued visibly among his disciples before his ascension. And this is sufficient for discussion of this fifth ground, wherof the cheefe particulars haue byn handled in diuers places before.

The discussion of the Fathers authorities alleaged by Ridley. Dionys. Areop. in Eccles. Hierarch.

10. Now then will we returne to his second ground againe, of the most certayne testimonies of the auncient Catholike Fathers. And first he alleageth *Saint Dionysius Areopagita*, for that in some places of his works he calleth yt bread And the like of *Saint Ignatius* to the *Philadelphians*, which we deny not, for *S. Paul* also calleth yt so, as before we haue shewed: but yet such bread, as in the same place he declareth to be the true body of Christ, sayinge: *that he vvhich receaueth yt vnworthily, shalbe guilty of the body and bloud of Christ*, addinge for his reason *non dyudicans corpus Domini*, for not discerninge the body of our Lord there present. And so *S. Ignatius* in the very selfe-same place saith: *that yt is the flesh and bloud of Christ*, as yow may read in that Epistle.

Ignat. in epist. ad Philadelph.

11. After these he citeth *Irenaeus* whose words are: *Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans, terrena & caelesti*, which *Ridley* translateth thus: Sacramentall bread consistinge of two natures, earthly and heauenly: But by *Maister Ridleys* leaue *Eucharistia* in this place is fraudulently translated by him *Sacramentall bread*, except he

meane as we do, and as *Irenaeus* did, that yt was the body of Christ, but called bread for that yt was made of bread: For that *Irenaeus* in the very same place, wryting against heretiks asketh this question: *Quomodo constabit eis, eum panem in quo gratia acta sint, corpus esse Domini sui?*

*Iren. lib. 4.
cons. haer.
cap. 34.*

How shall yt be made euident to these heretiks, that this bread, in which thanks haue byn giuen, is the body of their Lord? Wherto he aunswered, and proueth the same by diuers arguments: so as no place of any Father could haue byn alleaged more against himselfe, then this is by *Ridley*. And as for that he saith, that the Eucharist consisteth of two natures, *earth-ly* and *heauenly*, he meaneth euidently, by the heauenly nature, the true body of Christ, and by the earthly nature, the externall symbolls, formes, and accidents. And so much of him.

12. And the selfe-same thinge do meane both *Theoderete* and *Gelasius*, heere also by him alleaged, as vsinge the like phrases; that the natures of bread and wyne do remayne, which they vnderstand of the externall symbolls, formes and accidents. For as for the *reall presence*, they do both of them affirme yt in the same places by *Ridley* alleaged. And so this shall suffice for this place, there being nothing els worthy aunsweringe. And now yf yow consider, what variety of plaine and perspicuous authorities haue byn alleaged by vs before, both out of the disputations and otherwise, for confirmation of the Cathol

*Theod. dia?
2. Gelas. 1.
de duabus
naturis.*

beleefe

For pag.
2261.

beleefe of the reall-presence and Transubstantiation, yow will easily see what broken wares these bee, which Protestants bring forth to the contrary, and how fondly this second ground of *Ridleyes* proofes is intituled by him; the most certaine testimonies of the auncient Catholike Fathers: vvhich after my iudgement (saith he) do sufficiently declare this matter. And I will not greatly stand against him, for that the mans iudgement being peruerred by heresie, faction and ambition of those tymes, any thinge would seeme sufficient to him to draw him to that byas, whervnto himselfe inclined. And thus much of this article.

*About the third Article of the Sacrifice
of the Masse. §. 2.*

For pag.
2261.

13. For that there was little or nothinge disputed of this third article, eyther in *Cambridge*, *Oxford*, or *London*, except only a little against *Latimer*, as presently we shall see, I haue thought best to betake me only to *Ridleyes* determination in this matter: he beginneth the same thus: Now in the later conclusion, concerninge the sacrifice, because yt dependeth vpon the first (to witt of the reall-presence) I will in few vvords declare vvhat I thinke; for yf we once agree in that, the vvhole controuersie in the other vvill soone be at an end. Marke heere good reader that *Ridley* confesseth this controuersie of the sacrifice to depend

pend of the reall-presence, which reall-presence being so substantially proued before, as yow haue heard, little doubt can be made of this; yet will Ridley tell vs what he thinketh (a goodly ground for vs to hange our soules on) which is, that there is no sacrifice at all, but that of Christ vpon the Crosse, and he will tell vs also his grounds for so thinkinge: *Two things* (saith he) *there be, vvhich do perswade me, to* Fox *bid.* *vvitt, certayne places of scripture, and certayne testimonyes of the Fathers.* So he. And as for scriptures, he alleageth no one, but out of the Epistle to the Hebrues; that Christ entred once for *Heb. 9.* all into the holy-place, and obtayned for vs eternall redemption. And againe. That Christ vvvas once offered *Heb. 10.* to take away the sinnes of many. And yet further: that with one offeringe he made perfect for euer those that are sanctified. And hauinge cyted these places, he maketh this conclusion. These scriptures do perswade me to belecue, that there is no other oblation of Christ (albeit I am not ignorant there are many sacrifices) but that vvhich vvvas once made vpon the Crosse.

14. Heere now yow may see the force of a passionate iudgement, and how little doth suffice to perswade a man to any heresie, that is inclined therunto of himselfe. I would aske of Ridley heere, how chaunceth yt that S. Chrysostome, S. Basill, S. Ambrose, S. Cyrill, S. Hierome, S. Augustine and other Fathers cyted before so abundantly, and perspicuously affirming the dayly sacrifice of the masse, and distinguishing betweene *Cruentum & incruentum sacrificium*, he bloudy

The difference be-
tweene
Ridley and
the ancient
Fathers in
their per-
suasions.

bloudy sacrifice of Christ on the Crosse once offered vp for all; And the selfe-same sacrifice dayly reiterated, and offered againe in many places throughout the world, after an vnbloudy manner: how these Fathers, I say, had not byn persuaded, as *Ridley* was, by these places of scripture to deny the Sacrifice of the Masse? had they not read (thinke yow) the Epistle to the Hebrewes; or did they not vnderstand yt as well as *Ridley*? and how then was *Ridley* persuaded, and not they? there reason is, that, which he touched before, when he said: *after my iudgement, &c.* For that he followed his owne iudgement, blynded by his owne affection in this point against the masse, and they followed not their owne iudgement, but the vniuersall iudgement and beleefe of the Catholike Church in their dayes, and so must *Ridley* giue vs leaue to follow them, rather then him.

*Aug. ep. 23.
& l. 43. 9.
61. & l. 20.
ca. 7. Faust.
Manich.
ca. 26 20.*

15. As for his second motiue of certayne testimonies of the Fathers, yt is so weake and broken a thinge, as he dareth not come forth with yt, but only quoteth certayne places of *Saint Augustine*, wherby he saith that the Christians keepe a memoriall of the sacrifice past; and that *Fulgentius* in his booke *de fide* calleth the same a commemoration. And these be all the Fathers, and their authorities which he alleageth for his second motiue: wherby yow may see, that he was moued by a little against the masse; For we deny not but that the sacrifice of the masse is a commemoration also of
the

the
ypoc
imp
at al
cont
etua
uera
prof
nall
cred
Cros
and
the A
of, a
rensis
whe
doth
and
And
tymen
differ
man
mony
again
euid
sotom
fice
quic
might
shing
furth
ferre
heerin

the death, passion, and Sacrifice of Christ
vpon the Crosse, and he that in steed of these
impertinent citations out of *S. Austen* nothing
at all to the purpose, would lay downe on the
contrary side, all the cleere, euident, and effe-
ctuell places, sentences, discourses and asse-
uerations, which this holy Father hath in
profe and confirmation of the visible exter-
nall sacrifice of the masse, wherein Christs sa-
cred body, the same that was offered on the
Crosse, is offered againe dayly both for quicke
and dead by Christian Catholike Priests on
the Altar, might make a whole Treatise ther-
of, and I remitt the reader to *Hieronymus Tor-*
rensis his collection, called *Confessio Augustiniana*,
where throughout a 11. or 12. paragraphes, he
doth set downe large authorities, most plaine
and euident out of the said Fathers works.
And yt is inough for vs at this tyme, that *La-*
tymer being pressed in his disputations with
doubters of these authorities answered: I am not
ashamed to acknowledge my ignorance, and these testi-
monyes are more then I can beare away, and after
again, being further pressed with the most
euident authorities of *S. Augustine*, and *S. Chry-*
ostome in particular, affirminge that the sacri-
fice of the masse is propitiatory both for
quicke and dead, he answered: The Doctors
might be deceaued in some points, though not in all
things: I beleue them when they say vvell. And yet
further: I am of their faith vwhen they say vvell. I re-
ferre my selfe to my L. of *Canterburys* booke vvholy
heerin. And yet againe, I haue said vwhen they say
A 2 vvell

Torrens. in
Confess.
August.
lib. 3. cap. 7.

Fox pag.
1325.

Fox pag.
1326.

370 A review of ten pub. Diss. about Rel. Chap. 6.
yvell and bringe the scriptures for them, I am of their
faith. And further. Augustine requireth not to be be-
leeued. So he. And by this yow may see, what
accompt they make both of S. Augustine and
other Fathers, notwithstandinge for a shew,
sometymes they will cyte some places out of
them little to the purpose, but being witting
in their owne consciences, that really and
substantially they make against them, they
shift them off finally in this order as yow haue
heard, and will beleue and teach only as
pleaseth themselues, which is the peculiar
pride and willfullnes of heresie, from which
God deliuer vs. And with this I end this
whole Treatise.

FINIS.

A further answer to y^e Bishopps words: /
I haue y^e Bishopps cannot properly be contradicted in
mistake, for a mistake is a false iudgment. I say
within iudg, not thinke, so that it is impossible
shoud be properly mistaken in y^e Eucharist,
with the y^e substance of bread, nor wine
saying. But in a b^og strict, and vulgar
s^{en}sation, soe may say a b^og y^e mistaken, or
contradicted, when y^e iudgment woud be mistaken,
if it followed (as it doo usually) y^e Impression
of sense.

6.
their
be be-
what
e and
hew,
out of
tting
and
they
haue
ly as
culiar
which
d this

1
all
of
off
rist
rind
lgar
a, or
Hake
ssion

